

THE EXPOSITORY TIMES.

Notes of Recent Exposition.

THE central theme of Christianity, as of other religions, is its conception of God. 'To-day,' as Mr. WHITEHEAD says, 'there is but one religious dogma in debate: What do you mean by "God"? And in this respect, to-day is like all its yesterdays. This is the fundamental religious dogma, and all other dogmas are subsidiary to it.'

The Christian conception of God has been likened to a threefold cord. One strand of that cord comes from general religious experience. It is the conviction that God is a personal being. And what is implied for the religious man in the thought of God as personal? It is not, or should not be, that God is a being possessed of 'body, parts, and passions,' like a human person. It is that God is a being with whom man may enter into personal relations; which is to say, with whom he may hold communion or fellowship. God may respond to the heart that seeks Him, as the answering echo is awakened with the striking of the musical chord.

It is said that in the Muhammadan religion the sense of the Divine love and goodness is somewhat deficient, and that as a consequence the relation between Allah and his worshipper tends to be formal and external; yet it is undeniably a personal relation. In the religion of Israel the relation between Jehovah and His worshipper is close and intimate and richly personal. It is enough to recall the Book of Psalms, which truly contains, as Mr.

Prothero puts it, 'the whole music of the heart of man, swept by the hand of his Maker.'

But the deepest and most personal relationship of all is surely that of the Christian believer to his God. It is expressed through the great spiritual symbols of fatherhood and sonship: 'Now are we the sons of God, and it doth not yet appear what we shall be.'

This, then, is the testimony of religious experience in general, that God, whatever else He may be in the depths of His unfathomable nature, is at least a personal being, with whom the worshipper may enter into fellowship. And here is the first strand of that threefold cord of conviction which is the Christian idea or conception of God.

The second strand comes from the philosophic insight; and philosophic insight is not restricted to professional philosophers. It is the conviction that God is the ultimate reality of the universe, the basic principle which unifies all things, the absolute or self-sufficient being behind all things and in whom all things live and move and have their being.

Muhammadans, Hebrews, Christians, and indeed most believers in one God, not only regard God as a personal being, but attribute to Him mastery over the universe. As the first of these convictions has its source in the religious experience, the second

has its source—as already said—in the philosophic insight. And as religious experience deepens and reflection matures the two meanings of God tend to coalesce, and the personal being with whom man holds converse, and unto whom he lifts hands of prayer, is explicitly acknowledged as identical with the ultimately real being whereof philosophy is in quest.

But there is nothing distinctively Christian in the conception of God as hitherto stated. A third strand of conviction remains to be interwoven with the other two, and it is the distinctively Christian one. It comes from the specific Christian experience. It is the conviction that God has so revealed Himself in Jesus Christ that in Jesus Christ as in none other we may discern the Divine character and will. Jesus Christ is a portrait in time of the Divine eternal nature, a window—as Dr. Adams Brown expresses it—through which we may behold the Divine face. This is the distinctively Christian conviction, and with it the Christian conception of God is completed.

And the full Christian conception of God is summed up in the name of Father. This expressive symbol serves to convey the thought of kinship with man, of likeness to him, which is involved in the idea of God as a personal being. Again, it serves also to convey the thought of supreme power and authority which is involved in the idea of God as the ultimate reality of things. Lastly, no other name can better convey the thoughts of holiness, love, and sacrifice which are involved in the idea of God as revealing His character and will in Jesus Christ. He that hath seen Christ hath seen the Father.

Personality, Reality, and Christlike character—such are the three strands composing the Christian conception of God. It is not easy for Christian thought to weave them together in one. But Christian faith does it, and this threefold cord is not lightly broken.

Mansfield College, Oxford, has celebrated its

Jubilee. We should like with all respect to offer our hearty congratulations on the interesting occasion, and in a sentence to express the gratitude which, with so many more, we feel towards that distinguished centre of Christian scholarship.

The Jubilee has been commemorated by the College itself by the issue of a volume of Essays by past and present members of the staff. The subject is *Christian Worship: Studies in its History and Meaning*, edited by Nathaniel MICKLEM (Milford; 12s. 6d. net).

The choice of subject is very significant. Fifty years ago, nay, twenty years ago, it would not have been Worship that was selected. It might have been 'Theological Essays' or 'Biblical Studies,' or even 'The Principles of Independency.' It might have been almost anything except 'Worship.'

For it is only now that in all the churches in our land outside the Roman and the Anglican Communion there is a growing feeling that we have strangely and stupidly paid little if any attention to the study of the Christian Cultus, and an uneasy fear that that neglect has cost and lost us more than we like to contemplate. In all our churches, indeed, there have been individual ministers who set store by the study of Worship, and did what they could to disseminate more adequate views. But theological students left the Colleges with practically no knowledge of the history of Worship, and quite pitiful instruction as to what the aims of Public Worship are and the means of realizing them. It was thought that if a man were sincere he might be left to guide the congregational worship as he thought best.

We are realizing the folly of that. In the colleges some attempt is being made to prepare men to conduct Divine Service as it ought to be conducted. But we need yet much more. What we should have in each college is a Chair of, or Lecture-ship in, Liturgics. Mansfield College has given us an approach to a text-book on the subject, and we bespeak for it a very wide circulation.

The Essays fall into three groups as they deal with the Biblical data, the subsequent history, or the principles of public worship. The topics are treated each of them by a scholar who has earned the right to be heard. In the first group we have WHEELER ROBINSON on the Old Testament Background; MANSON on the Jewish Background; CADMAN on the Word of God in the New Testament; DODD on the Lord's Supper in the New Testament. In the second we have VERNON BARTLET on the Ancient Liturgies; R. S. FRANKS on Worship in the Middle Ages; MOFFATT on Luther; C. J. CADOUX on Zwingli; WHALE on Calvin; A. G. MATTHEWS on the Puritans. In part three E. R. MICKLEM deals with Psychological Considerations; E. SHILLITO with the Preaching of the Word; K. L. PARRY with Prayer and Praise; N. MICKLEM with the Sacraments.

In an introductory Essay Dr. A. E. GARVIE deals with the Philosophy of Worship. Like all that Dr. GARVIE writes, it is a characteristically 'meaty' article, raising many points of interest and clarifying every point raised. Let us confine ourselves to almost the last. Should Christianity at its best or purest recognize special times or places? Yes, says Dr. GARVIE, it should. 'While religion at its highest phase consecrates all time, all space, every man; every day is the Lord's Day, every place is God's house and every man God's child; yet man being social, there must be community in worship; there are sacred seasons when and sacred places where the corporate acts of worship must take place. Without any superstition the Christian religion may recognize the spiritual value of times and spaces set apart for worship.'

'So also not all the worshippers can take part in all the acts of worship. The service must be conducted and the sermon preached by one person who represents the congregation in these corporate acts.' 'There have been false prophets as well as unworthy priests; yet priesthood as mediating the approach of man to God and prophethood as mediating the approach of God to man, freed of all pretensions to exclusive validity and authority,

are necessary and legitimate agencies of the community of worship.'

This justification of holy times and holy places leads Dr. GARVIE naturally to raise the question as to 'forms' or symbolism in worship. All his own instincts, he tells us, are in favour of as little material apparatus as possible; yet he feels compelled to ask if this indifference to form is altogether justified.

We remember the late Dr. Stalker raising as a curious point for his class to consider what justification, if any, underlies the undoubted fact that many Protestants have such a profound distrust in the eye as opposed to the ear as the gateway of religious instruction, so that their worship is so denuded of symbol.

Similarly Dr. GARVIE here argues, 'Man' is no more a disembodied angel than a soulless beast. Even if we distinguish soul and body and assert the superiority of soul to body, body is the one organ of man's self-expression and self-communication.' 'Man has æsthetic sense to appreciate and æsthetic talent to reproduce beauty of shape, colour, and sound. May not beauty claim a place in religion with truth or goodness? It is in worship it can most fully be expressed. The senses are not more alien to sin than to holiness, the imagination more alien to truth than the intellect. Theology is symbol even when it attempts to define: 'Preaching is "spoken symbol"; why should "acted symbol" be so suspect? May not our worship have lost its attractiveness for many because it does not satisfy the whole man with all his varied interests?'

This matter of 'symbol' is also handled very suggestively in E. R. MICKLEM's paper on 'Psychological Considerations.' He points out that 'the Word of God is mediated to us through "phenomena"—through presentations to the senses chiefly the visual and auditory.' There is always bound to be the risk of the minds of the congregation not getting past the 'phenomenon,' whatever it be, to the spiritual reality. Whether it be the liturgical symbolical acts in which 'High Church'

worship abounds, or the sermon of the service from which symbols and rites have all but completely vanished, there is always the danger, as real in the latter case as in the former, that some part of the congregation will not get beyond æsthetic or logical appreciation. As one may leave a 'High Church' service saying 'what beautiful vestments,' one may leave the unadorned saying 'what a beautiful discourse.' So, as Professor MICKLEM proceeds very ably to expound, psychological considerations are of quite surpassing interest and importance.

Rebel Religion, by the Rev. B. C. PLOWRIGHT, B.A., B.D. (Allenson; 5s. net), contains in the opening chapter a penetrating analysis of the contemporary world-situation. The book, as might be expected, is on the side of the angels. But the author is no prophet of smooth things. He realizes the gravity of the challenge which is being hurled at the Christian faith from many quarters, and he starts his awakening argument by exposing the realities that underlie the unrest and revolt of our time.

The old Victorian optimism is as antiquated as the belief in witches, as unreal as a heraldic picture of a unicorn. The master convictions which for the Victorian bound all life together in a pleasing unity have been broken down. A landslide has buried our accustomed ways of thinking. We can no longer discern the lay-out of our civilization or understand the nature of the life which is the creative force in that civilization. The author heaps metaphor on metaphor, Niagara-torrents, earthquakes, débâcles, to make his point impressive and convincing. He then proceeds to detail.

Let us examine three of the basic ideas of the nineteenth century, and we shall see how complete the débâcle has been. First of all, the Meaning of Life, then Progress, and finally Democracy. Until recently all these formed part and parcel of the common stock of inherited and unquestioned beliefs. They were the working assumptions derived from experience and reflection. To-day every one of

them has been seriously questioned, and in some quarters passionately repudiated.

Take the first, the Meaning of Life. In the nineteenth century life was regarded and measured against the certainty of an eternal future. The present was a preparatory period of discipline. Man was immortal, bound for heaven or hell, according to his deserts, but certainly for one or other. Life was real and earnest because it was only the vestibule of life everlasting. It had essentially an other-worldly meaning. To-day all this has gone, partly because of developments within religious thought itself, and partly for other reasons.

Among these reasons are the following. The belief in hell went because of its flagrant violation of justice. It was unjust to punish a man with suffering for ever and ever because of some sins that did not seem so very flagrant. The punishment did not fit the crime. In addition to that, there was the easy-going Victorian belief in the amiable Fatherhood of God, what the author calls the 'Grandad' theology. In reaction from the old severe Calvinism, and owing to the rediscovery of the 'historic Jesus,' God was represented as a kind and benevolent Person who would not be hard on anybody.

But even more serious reasons were two others. One was the new concentration on social problems. Within religion itself the idea of the Kingdom of God received a fresh emphasis, and with it the ideal of a new world of righteousness *here*. And this chimed with the attention given to the claims of the submerged and the demand for better conditions. All this tended to concentrate men's minds on the present, and to weaken the other-worldly idea of life. And this process was advanced finally by the discoveries of science, which promised to make man master in the house of life. Material plenty obscured spiritual values and needs. And the tremendous achievements made in our own time in the conquest of Nature have cut at the roots of man's dependence on God and created a self-confidence which was alien to the Christian attitude.

Hence the growth of Naturalism, and the conception of religion as 'The Great Illusion.'

The second Victorian idea was that of Progress. The idea was soundly based on experience. The steady rise in the standard of living, the increase of material wealth, the enormous multiplication of the instruments of pleasure and satisfaction appeared to give a warrant to the idea that things were getting better and better. And the idea seemed to be confirmed by the great discovery of Evolution; only 'seemed,' because it was a false interpretation of evolution that was made to serve the idea of progress. Evolution in reality includes decay and deterioration as much as advance and development. Nevertheless there seemed to be good grounds for believing in the inevitability of progress, and it was held as an axiom.

But this idea has been undermined. The War did much to destroy it. And after the War came the New Psychology, with its assertion that not reason but instinct dominates man. The greater part of the human mind was composed of deep, instinctive, unconscious forces, partly racial, partly hereditary, partly individual. The major decisions of life were made at the bidding of the unconscious. For Freud the unconscious was largely made up of sex impulse; for Adler, of the instinct of self-assertion and self-preservation; for Jung, of an instinctive drive, the libido, which might take one of many protean forms. Yet amid their differences all agree in the emphasis on the prevailing influence of instinct. Reason was little more than the obedient servant of instinct. And with this disappearance of the rationality of man went the main prop of the belief in inevitable progress.

Another influence working in the same direction was the new interpretation of history. The idea of progress was based on too narrow a range of facts. If, instead of concentrating on our own civilization, we regard the successive civilizations of history, we see a similar pattern in them all. They have their periods of birth, infancy, youth, maturity; and then also of decay, decline, and death. The same graph of history would do for every civiliza-

tion. For inevitable progress the new history substituted the idea of cyclic development. Civilizations were only successive whorls in the stream of time.

The third idea was that of Democracy. The Victorian Age regarded democracy as the perfect form of political organization. The ballot, and in the long-run universal suffrage, were the infallible cure-all of all social ills. But the march of thought and experience has undermined this idea also. For one thing, in our time it is the economic factor that is the deciding one, questions of food and wages and leisure and work. And political institutions are judged now by their value for these economic needs. And on that basis the value of the democratic ideal is being challenged by two things. One is experience. When faced by a grave economic crisis like unemployment the political machine has proved completely inadequate. It could not provide opportunity, security, or justice. It was shut in by convention and tradition. Politicians have tinkered with the problem, but nowhere have been courage and resource to deal with the facts.

The other hostile influence has been the flight from Reason already referred to. The essential basis of democracy is the rationality of man. But if men are not rational, but driven by instinct, then clearly democracy is impossible. The only alternative is to organize political life on the basis of the a-moral instincts. It is a menacing fact for democracy that in three great nations of Europe it has been abandoned—Russia, Germany, and Italy.

Such is the picture of our modern world drawn for us in this arresting volume. Never in all probability, says the writer, has any generation experienced such drastic disturbances in its life, or been compelled to adjust itself to them so swiftly as ours. Never was the ruin so complete. Yet in the very completeness of that ruin lies our hope. We have the opportunity to build as we will. This is one of the great creative epochs in history. For good or evil life has become plastic once more, and we are the makers of a civilization that will for long bear the stamp we put upon it.

The Anti-Marcionite Prologues to the Gospels.

BY THE REVEREND PROFESSOR W. F. HOWARD, M.A., D.D., HANDSWORTH COLLEGE, BIRMINGHAM.

AT the close of the year 1935 a new edition of Huck's invaluable *Synopsis of the First Three Gospels* appeared. This revision, undertaken by Professor Hans Lietzmann, brought the book for the first time into the full possession of English students who know no German, for Dr. F. L. Cross has translated all the German portion into English. One of the features that immediately struck those readers who are familiar with the earlier editions is a new section under the general heading, 'The Earliest Witnesses to the Synoptic Gospels.' Immediately after the well-known sentences of Papias, cited from Eusebius, comes a new section, 'The Oldest Anti-Marcionite Gospel Prologues.' There is no extant Prologue to Matthew, but we have a brief Marcan Prologue in Latin, a long Lucan Prologue in Greek, and a fairly short Johannine Prologue in Latin.

No new discovery is published by the printing of these Prologues. They have been known to scholars for many years. What is new is the prominence given to them as early witnesses to the Gospels, and in the title *Anti-Marcionite Prologues*.

Early in the new year *The Times* gave a report of a lecture delivered by Dr. Robert Eisler in London in which some rather extravagant views were expressed regarding the Fourth Gospel. This led to a most interesting correspondence in the course of which Dr. Eisler claimed that our knowledge of the authorship of the Fourth Gospel has been entirely altered by recent investigation of the Johannine Prologue. He himself offers a new interpretation of this passage by means of a repunctuation of the text. This was followed by a letter from Dr. F. L. Cross summarizing the results of recent studies and offering a new interpretation of the Johannine Prologue by means of an emended text.

Many who take an interest in Biblical studies are asking what is the meaning of this newly published evidence, and why it is that if the material has been known to the great scholars of the last century they failed to appreciate its significance. In this article we must limit ourselves to the shortest and simplest statement of the position.

I. (1) It has long been known that in many old Latin manuscripts there are 'Prologues,' or prefatory statements about the authorship or place of origin of various books in the New Testament, with a short summary of the writer's purpose and the occasion that has called them forth. The best

known examples relate to the Pauline Epistles. Thirty years ago it was established that these originated in Marcion's canon of 'the Apostle.' The most convenient form of which the general reader can study these Latin Marcionite Prologues to the Pauline Epistles is to be found in Professor Souter's *Text and Canon of the N.T.* (205 ff.), in Duckworth's 'Studies in Theology' series. Dr. Souter prints them in the order in which they would appear in a Marcionite copy of the Apostle, and shows that 'thus and thus only are they intelligible.' He also prints as an appendix the Catholic additions, and thus provides us with material for a most interesting study of the significance of the conflict with Marcion. Reference must also be made to the interesting account given by Harnack in *The Origin of the N.T.* (Appendix i.), in the 'Crown Theological Library.'

(2) Ten years before De Bruyne had established the Marcionite origin of the Prologues to the ten Pauline Epistles, Corsen had proved that the Prologues to the Latin Gospels found in many MSS were Monarchian in character, coming from one and the same pen, and had been intended originally for an edition of the Gospels. They bear clear traces of a modalistic-monarchian doctrine. Harnack argued that Rome was the most likely place during the pontificate of Zephyrinus (A.D. 198-217). They were afterwards worked over in an orthodox interest, and were of such high repute that they were incorporated in the Vulgate.

(3) Quite distinct from these were a few Gospel Prologues of a different sort. That to Matthew is not extant, but it was known that in a few scattered MSS Prologues to Mark, Luke, and John were to be found. In 1928 Dom Donatien de Bruyne added to his earlier settlement of the problem of the Marcionite Prologues to the Pauline Epistles a remarkable study of the Gospel Prologues. His essay in the July number of the *Revue Bénédictine* for that year opened a new chapter in the history of this subject, and as he gained the assent of Harnack—the greatest authority on the history of early Christian literature—his arguments may be taken as of convincing force (Harnack's essay, 'Die ältesten Evangelien-Prologe und die Bildung des NTs,' was reprinted from the *Sitzungsberichten der Preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften*, Phil.-Hist. Klasse, 1928, xxiv). De Bruyne, by an exhaustive search through the libraries of Europe

showed that so far from being three erratic, disconnected Prologues of a late date, found in a mere handful of MSS, they are unitary, are early, and are represented in at least thirty-eight different MSS from the fifth to the tenth century. In addition to the Latin Prologues, that to Luke is also extant in a Greek form, which has been found in a tenth-century MS. at Athens and an eleventh-century MS. in the Bodleian. The Greek Prologue to Luke was first printed in 1749, and has been generally available since Zahn published it in his commentary on Luke in 1913. The Latin Prologue to John was published by Cardinal Thomasius in 1688 from a MS. in the Vatican. It was discussed by Lightfoot in *Essays on Supernatural Religion* (1889), 210 ff. Further light was thrown on the history of this curious Prologue by F. C. Burkitt in *Two Lectures on the Gospels* (1901), 90 ff. He called attention to the presence of a second Prologue to John in a Spanish MS. of the tenth century (Codex Toletanus). The first part of this forms the beginning of the article on St. John in Jerome's book, *De Viris Illustribus*, whilst the last part is the very Prologue to which our attention has now been directed. Needless to say, vol. i. of Wordsworth's and White's great edition of the Vulgate gives all the material that was available at the end of last century.

II. To appreciate the significance of De Bruyne's thesis we must now look at the texts themselves. We take the text from De Bruyne's edition, adding in brackets any modification which Harnack has made in taking over the text.

The Marcan Prologue.—Marcus adseruit, qui colobodactylus est nominatus, ideo quod ad ceteram corporis proceritatem digitos minores habuisset. Iste interpres fuit Petri. Post excessionem ipsius Petri descripsit idem hoc in partibus Italiae evangelium.

The Lucan Prologue.—Est quidem Lucas Antiochensis Syrus, arte medicus, discipulus apostolorum; postea vero Paulum secutus est usque ad confessionem eius, serviens domino (H. deo) sine crimine. Uxorem numquam habuit, filios numquam procreavit, octoginta quattuor annorum obiit in Boeotia, plenus spiritu sancto. Igitur cum iam descripta essent evangelia, per Mattheum quidem in Iudaea, per Marcum autem in Italia, sancto instigatus spiritu, in Achaiae partibus hoc descripsit evangelium, significans per principium ante suum alia esse descripta, sed et sibi maximam necessitatem incumbere Graecis fidelibus cum summa diligentia omnem dispositionem narratione sua exponere, propterea ne Iudaicis fabulis desiderio tenerentur, neve hereticis fabulis et stultis sollici-

tationibus seducti excederent a veritate. Itaque perquam necessariam statim in principio sumpsit ab Iohannis unitate, quae est initium evangelii, praemissis domini nostri Iesu Christi, et fuit socius ad perfectionem populi, item inductionem baptismi atque passionis socius. Cuius profecto dispositionis exemplum meminit Malachiel propheta, unus de duodecim. Et tamen postremo scripsit idem Lucas Actus Apostolorum. Postmodum Iohannes apostolus scripsit Apocalypsin in insula Pathmos, deinde Evangelium in Asia.

(This is very clearly a translation of the Greek Prologue, which happily survives.)

Ἔστιν ὁ Λουκᾶς Ἀντιοχεὺς Σύρος, ἱατρὸς τῇ τέχνῃ, μαθητὴς ἀποστόλων γενόμενος καὶ ὕστερον Παύλῳ παρακολουθήσας μέχρις τοῦ μαρτυρίου αὐτοῦ, δουλεύσας τῷ κυρίῳ ἀπερισπάστως, ἀγνύσιος, ἄτεκνος, ἐτῶν ὀγδοήκοντα τεσσάρων ἐκοιμήθη ἐν τῇ Βοιωτίᾳ, πλήρης πνεύματος ἁγίου, οὗτος προυπαρχόντων ἤδη εὐαγγελίων, τοῦ μὲν κατὰ Ματθαίου ἐν τῇ Ἰουδαίᾳ ἀναγραφέντος· τοῦ δὲ κατὰ Μάρκον ἐν τῇ Ἰταλίᾳ, οὗτος πραλοτραπεῖς (H. προτραπεῖς) ὑπὸ πνεύματος ἁγίου ἐν τοῖς περὶ τὴν Ἀχαίαν τὸ πᾶν τοῦτο συνεγράψατο εὐαγγέλιον, δὴλῶν διὰ τοῦ προομίου τοῦτο αὐτὸ ὅτι πρὸ αὐτοῦ ἄλλα ἐστὶ γεγραμμένα καὶ ὅτι ἀνάγκαιον ἦν τοῖς ἐξ ἐθνῶν πιστοῖς τὴν ἀκριβῆ τῆς οἰκονομίας ἐκθέσθαι διήγησιν ὑπὲρ τοῦ μὴ ταῖς Ἰουδαϊκαῖς μυθολογίαις περισπᾶσθαι αὐτοὺς, μήτε ταῖς αἰρετικαῖς καὶ κεναῖς φαντασίαις ἀπατωμένους ἀστοχῆσαι τῆς ἀληθείας. ὡς ἀναγκαιοτάτην οὖν οὖσαν εὐθὺς ἐν ἀρχῇ παρεilhφάμεν τὴν τοῦ Ἰωάννου γέννησιν, ὅς ἐστιν ἀρχὴ τοῦ εὐαγγελίου, πρόδρομος τοῦ κυρίου γενόμενος καὶ κοινωνὸς ἐν τε τῷ καταρτισμῷ τοῦ εὐαγγελίου καὶ τῇ τοῦ βαπτίσματος διαγωγῇ καὶ τῇ τοῦ πνεύματος κοινωνίᾳ. ταύτης τῆς οἰκονομίας μέμνηται προφήτης ἐν τοῖς δώδεκα. καὶ δὴ μετέπειτα ἔγραψεν ὁ αὐτὸς Λουκᾶς Πράξεις Ἀποστόλων· ὕστερον δὲ Ἰωάννης ὁ ἀπόστολος ἐκ τῶν δώδεκα ἔγραψεν τὴν Ἀποκάλυψιν ἐν τῇ νήσῳ Πάτμῳ καὶ μετὰ ταῦτα τὸ Εὐαγγέλιον.

The Johannine Prologue.—Evangelium Iohannis manifestum et datum est ecclesiis ab Iohanne adhuc in corpore constituto, sicut Papias nomine Hieropolitanus, discipulus Iohannis carus, in exotericis, id est in extremis quinque libris retulit. Descripsit vero evangelium, dictante Iohanne recte. Verum Marcion hereticus, cum ab eo fuisset inprobatas eo quod contraria sentiebat, abiectus est ab Iohanne. Is vero scripta vel epistulas ad eum pertulerat a fratribus qui in Ponto fuerunt.

Dom de Bruyne draws three general conclusions from these texts:

1. There is strong evidence that the Latin is a translation from the Greek.

(a) In the Marcan Prologue the word *colobodactylus*, unknown in Latin, is obviously a transliteration of the Greek *κολοβοδάκτυλος*.

(b) Can there be any doubt which is the original form of the Lucan Prologue? If something more than linguistic feeling is called for, we may find further evidence in a statement by Irenæus: *plurima et magis necessaria Evangelii per hunc cognovimus, sicut Iohannis nativitatem*. On other grounds, de Bruyne has shown how probable it is that Irenæus was acquainted with these Prologues. His *cognovimus* corresponds to *παρελήφμεν* rather than to *sumpsit*.

(c) Internal evidence points strongly to a Greek origin of the Johannine Prologue. As Lightfoot observed (*Essays on Supernatural Religion*, 213), the phrase *adhuc in corpore constituto* is obviously a translation of *ἐτι ἐν τῷ σώματι καθεστῶτος*, and *exotericis* so baffled a scribe that he hazarded the futile explanation *id est in extremis*. Originally the text must have read *ἐξηγητικούς*, for the well-known statement in Eusebius (*H.E.* III. xxxix) tells us that 'of Papias five treatises are extant which have also the title of "Interpretation (*ἐξήγησις*) of the Oracles of the Lord."' *Ἐξηγητικούς* would be transliterated *exegeticis*, and Lightfoot may be right in his assumption that a scribal error is responsible for the change into *exotericis*.

2. The Monarchian Prologues are an expansion of these shorter Prologues, and are based, as we can see clearly in the case of the Lucan Prologue, upon the Latin rendering rather than upon the Greek original. We have no space to enter upon this here, but the reader can test the matter by comparing the texts given above with the longer Prologue printed with an English translation in Jackson and Lake's *Beginnings of Christianity*, ii. 242 ff. The argument will be found in Zahn's *Kommentar*; Lucas, 739 ff.; and still more fully in Dom Chapman's *Early History of the Vulgate Gospels*.

3. The three Prologues form a unity.

(a) They are found together in both the main branches of the manuscript tradition so carefully set forth by de Bruyne.

(b) The Marcan and Lucan Prologues use the same phraseology. Compare '*descripsit idem hoc in partibus Italiae evangelium*' and '*in Achaiae partibus hoc descripsit evangelium*.'

(c) The Priscillianist redactor of the Monarchian Prologues in the fourth century made the

same use of the Marcan and of the Lucan Prologues.

(d) The same anti-Marcionite tendency appears in the Lucan and the Johannine Prologues. In Luke the beginning of the Gospel is found in the baptism by John in fulfilment of O.T. prophecy. In John the condemnation of Marcion is expressly stated.

III. The reason why a new importance has lately been found in these Prologues is that de Bruyne convinced the great Harnack that their date lies between the years A.D. 160 and 180. De Bruyne emphasizes the following points:

(a) It was only in Rome that Mark was known by the nickname *colobodactylus*, and these Prologues were written when Greek was still the language of the Roman Church. (b) The Johannine Prologue considers heresy from the standpoint of Rome, not of Asia Minor, for it says nothing about Cerinthus or Ebionism, but makes an unexpected reference to Marcion, and probably to events which took place in Rome rather than in Asia. (c) They were written when the Marcionite crisis was over, but was still fresh in the memory. (d) Papias is used, but neither Tertullian nor Eusebius. There seems to be a literary connexion with Irenæus, but Irenæus seems to be the borrower. The Prologue is independent in its mention of Mark's nickname, the place where Mark and Luke wrote, and the celibacy of Luke. (e) There is good reason to place the Latin translation of these Prologues in Africa at the end of the third century.

Harnack offers some additional observations.

(a) It is very significant that the Lucan Prologue expressly emphasizes the Lucan authorship of Acts and the Johannine and apostolic authorship of Revelation. For we know from both Tertullian and Hippolytus that Marcion coupled Acts and Revelation in his condemnation as both false.

(b) The reference to the author of Revelation as *Ἰωάννης ὁ ἀπόστολος ἐκ τῶν δώδεκα*, whilst Luke and Paul are introduced without any indication of their rank, seems to imply distinction from another John enjoying apostolic rank in a wider sense. Harnack's inference would seem to be that here we are closer to the Papias tradition of two Johns and farther from Irenæus.

(c) The statement in the Prologue of Luke's relationship to Paul can be paralleled very closely from the Latin writings of Irenæus (see Cadbury's citations, *Beginnings of Christianity*, ii. 212 ff.). But Irenæus makes the relationship of Luke to the Apostles and to Paul much closer, and even describes his Gospel as that which was preached by Paul. The Prologue shows no sign of this. Where

close similarity of phraseology points to borrowing, it is therefore more likely that Irenæus is the borrower.

IV. For most readers the centre of interest lies in the Johannine Prologue. If de Bruyne and Harnack are correct in their dating of this, we have a statement from the third quarter of the second century telling us (a) that Papias in his lost *Expositions* asserted that the Fourth Gospel was written in the lifetime of John, and taken down at his dictation by Papias; (b) that Marcion the heretic, after being censured by Papias for holding contrary opinions, was cast off by John; (c) that Marcion had brought to John commendatory letters from the brethren in Pontus.

It is hardly to be wondered at that, at a time when the Prologue rested upon only one ninth-century MS., Lightfoot dismissed as untrustworthy 'a passage which contains such obvious anachronisms and other inaccuracies.' But how could any one who had Papias's *Exposition* before him attribute such a statement to him as that he had taken down this Gospel at the dictation of John? Lightfoot's suggestion is just as valuable now that we have good reason to date the Prologue as pre-Irenæan. 'Papias may have quoted the Gospel "delivered by John to the Churches, which they wrote down from his lips" (*ὁ ἀπέγραφον ἀπὸ τοῦ στόματος αὐτοῦ*); and some later writer, mistaking the ambiguous *ἀπέγραφον*, interpreted it, "I wrote down," thus making Papias himself the amanuensis' (*Essays on Supernatural Religion*, 214).

B. W. Bacon (*Journal of Theological Studies*, xliii. [1921-22] 134-160) writing in 1922 when Harnack's massive work on Marcion had appeared, but before Harnack had been converted by de Bruyne to the early date of the Prologue, took another line of treatment. He regarded the statement about the Johannine authorship of the Gospel as a misunderstanding of Papias's assertion that Revelation was apostolic. For Bacon believed that the authorship of the Gospel was not a burning question in the time of Papias, whereas his millenarian views were sharply contested and could best be defended by claiming Johannine authorship for the Apocalypse. The reference to the condemnation of Marcion's heresy Bacon explained in a most ingenious way. We know from Tertullian that Marcion for a long time after his arrival at Rome was zealous in his devotion to the orthodox faith, which seems to rule out a previous condemnation in Asia. But there are certain passages in Tertullian's own writings in which Bacon found the source of the strange statement in our Prologue.

(a) 'If thou hadst not rejected the Scriptures which were contrary to thine own opinions, the Gospel of John would have confounded thee' (*De Carne Christi*, iii, where Tertullian is reproaching Marcion for resorting to inferior sources while rejecting apostolic authority). (b) 'He has erased everything that was contrary to his own opinion, while everything that agreed with his own opinion he has retained' (*Adv. Marc.* iv. vi, with reference to Marcion's arbitrary excisions from the Gospel). Just before these words Tertullian had referred to the letter which Marcion had delivered to the Church authorities at Rome after his arrival from Pontus. In more than one passage Tertullian says that Marcion is the heretic designated Antichrist by John in his Epistle (1 Jn 4²⁻³). Thus the prophetic condemnation of Marcion by John which Tertullian finds in the Epistle has become in the Prologue an actual rejection of Marcion in Asia. Ingenious as this argument is, it deserves, in my opinion, more careful treatment than either de Bruyne or Harnack has given to it. Is their argument that the Prologue is pre-Irenæan quite water-tight? In all fresh discussions of the problem Bacon's thesis must be fully considered.

Two recent attempts to throw light upon the date and authorship of the Fourth Gospel by means of this Prologue must be mentioned, as the letters by these two scholars in *The Times*, already referred to, have done much to bring the anti-Marcionite Prologues into the public interest.

(a) Dr. Robert Eisler has argued in his book, *Das Rätsel des Johannesevangeliums* (Zürich, 1936—Sonderdruck Eranos-Jahrbuch 1935), 325-65, that the original text read: *Evangelium Iohannis manifestum est ab Iohanne adhuc in corpore constituto sicut Papias nomine Hieropolitanus in exegeticis quinque libris retulit, descripsit vero evangelium, dictante Iohanne recte verum, Marcion haereticus. Cum ab eo fuisset improbatus, eo quod contraria sentiebat, abiectus est ab Iohanne. Is vero scripta vel epistulas ad eum pertulerat a fratribus qui in Ponto fuerunt. By this punctuation of a reconstructed text Dr. Eisler arrives at the astonishing result that Marcion was the scribe to whom the author dictated the Gospel. As we are not here concerned with Dr. Eisler's theories about the authorship and Gnostic character of the Fourth Gospel, we add no comment.*

(b) Dr. F. L. Cross in a letter to *The Times* (February 10th, 1936) wrote: 'My own reading of the Prologue, if I may set it down dogmatically, is that in its original form it asserted that the Fourth Gospel was written by John the Elder at the dicta-

tion of John the Apostle when the latter had reached a very great age.' We must wait for his own statement and the reasons which seem to him to support such a reconstruction of the text. Presumably it involves a transference of the words *discipulus Iohannis carus* from where it stands to a position immediately following the words *descripsit vero*.

Finally, may I express my own view that no such drastic reconstruction of the text as either of these attempts is called for? That the statement about Papias is, as Lightfoot suspected, due to a misunderstanding of a casual remark in Papias's *Exposition* seems most probable. I also suspect

that the statement in Papias itself was based upon Jn 21. It seems extremely probable that the apparently irrelevant reference to Marcion supplies the key to the date of the Prologues. This comprehensive introduction to the fourfold Gospel arose at the time when the Roman Church was just recovering from the controversy with the arbitrary subjectivism of Marcion and his followers. At that time no introduction to the Canon could be silent about that heresiarch, as the Muratorian Canon bears witness. The problem, however, that seems to deserve most careful investigation at present is the relation between this Prologue and Tertullian. What is the connecting link?

The Sixth Commandment.

BY THE REVEREND CANON STUART D. MORRIS, M.A., VICAR OF ST. BARTHOLOMEW'S, BIRMINGHAM.

SEEN in their true proportions, the commandments are the laws of the good life—not so much negative restrictions hedging off ground which must not be trodden as sign-posts which, if they deny a right-of-way in one direction, imply it in another. It has been said that a man never makes up his mind what he is going to do until he has made up his mind what he is not going to do. The negative attitude is the necessary prelude to the positive. To see life in terms of the attitude which is forbidden leads to a consideration of the alternative attitude which is commanded. This is essentially true of the Ten Commandments, which are used and fulfilled by Christ precisely in this way. Moreover, these laws are not only not negative, they are also not isolated. They are positive in their content and connected in their sequence.

God is one. Man is to be one—at one with himself, at one with his fellow-men. Salvation is to be seen in terms of saneness, a balanced personality, possible only when man learns how to bring all his powers under one control and direct all his ways to one end. The unity of God assures him that this is possible. The worship of God shows him the way by which it is to be achieved. So, too, life is to be one. Unity is an essential characteristic of God, of man, and of all else that comes within the eternal act of His creation.

When, then, the laws of right relationship between man and God lead on to those of right relationship between him and his fellows, it is the first class within the school of life with which they are concerned. The smallest sphere is dealt with

first, and right relations have to be established with a man's first neighbours—his father and mother. It is within the home that man first learns that he is one of many, but that the many are one. Nevertheless, if charity is to begin at home it is only that it may flow out thence and cover the world. Indeed, once man is brought into right relationships with God, he finds himself involved in an ever-widening series of relationships. In word and deed he has to express the honour due to God's name. He must find his true dignity as a workman whose work honours both God and man, and in order that he himself may be honoured he must himself be honourable, 'true and just in all his dealings, hurting no one by word or deed, bearing no malice or hatred in his heart.' As the sphere of relationships widens, so he has to learn the principles which govern the larger life, and the first of these is thrown into the form 'Thou shalt not kill.'

Here, perhaps, in a recitation of the commandments a note of unreality creeps in. A man may well recognize the need of being on his guard against dishonouring God or breaking up his home, but the temptation to kill seems to him to be so remote as to make his prayer, 'Lord, have mercy upon us, and incline our hearts to keep this law' a mere formula. Yet once the full implications of this commandment are realized, no prayer has more significance to-day or is more necessary. For how does Christ expound this law? 'Ye have heard that it was said to them of old time, Thou shalt not kill; and whosoever shall kill shall be in danger of the judgment: but I say unto you, that

every one who is angry with his brother¹ shall be in danger of the judgment; . . . and whosoever shall say, Thou fool, shall be in danger of the hell of fire. If therefore thou art offering thy gift at the altar, and there rememberest that thy brother hath aught against thee, leave there thy gift before the altar, and go thy way, first be reconciled to thy brother, and then come and offer thy gift' (Mt 5²¹⁻²⁴). Thus Christ takes the Law out of the realm of unreal abstractions as He says, 'You have understood this to apply only to the act of killing, but God understands it to apply to anger expressed both in violent thought or abusive language.' But the fulfilment of the Law demands not only the negative abstention from such thoughts and words, it issues in a positive duty. A sincere attempt to enter into peaceful relations with any to whom we have given a cause of grievance is a Christian obligation, and failure thus to restore fellowship with man involves a divine ban. Only the peacemakers share in God's purposes and can be recognized by God as His children (Mt 5⁹).

Within this exposition of the sixth commandment by Christ is to be found the application of it to all to whom it might seem that they are never likely to be murderers. The commandment is not only real, it is vital, for the spirit of murder is abroad. This generation saw it uncaged in 1914, since when it has not ceased to roam the earth. Fear, hatred, and suspicion are the garments which it wears, and so disguised it can creep into the hearts of ordinary men and women, and distort their minds until they come to believe that those who slay their brethren are doing God's service.

It may be argued that in a sub-Christian world statesmen have to take a line of action which is relatively right. But Christians cannot rest content with what is only relatively right. They have to maintain the full claim of Christ and stand by His principles without compromise, or they abrogate their right to judge at all.

A politician may recognize that war is a catastrophe and yet build his policy upon the assumption that war is inevitable. That, indeed, is the tragedy of the present situation in which many of us are coming to regard war not so much as possible but as probable or inevitable, unless this nation is strong enough to stop it. Against such policies is written, Thou shalt not kill. A German philosopher—Bernardi—has said that a state of war exists not only when nations are at each others' throats, but when war is regarded as a legitimate instrument

of national policy. The attempt to check force by force, to meet the weapons of war with weapons of war, is not to avert disaster but to invite it. To organize a war state is to prepare to kill, even though such killing is regarded as the last expedient. It is impossible to make force the final arbiter without being prepared to let loose, if need be, the spirit of hatred and violence, and to demonstrate the superiority of your own force by the number of other people you can kill. It is not only to prepare to break the Law, it is to make the breaking of it inevitable. But to a Christian war cannot be inevitable unless it is recognized as part of the declared plan and purpose of God. He must be able to square it not only with the command that he is not to kill, but also with the whole method of God's action as revealed in Christ.

The experience of war shows how the old national gods can still dethrone the God who is One, and the Father of all men:

God heard the embittered nations sing and shout, 'Gott strafe England!' and 'God save the King!' God this, God that, and God the other thing. 'Good God!' said God, 'I've got my work cut out.'

In no other way can conscience begin to tolerate the killing of those who otherwise must be regarded as within the one family, and man by his own reaction recognizes the eternal value of the sixth commandment. So, because 'God hath made of one blood all nations of men to dwell on all the face of the earth' (Ac 17²⁶), all war *is* civil war. Moreover, even if in days gone by war could be regarded and justified as fair fighting between professional soldiers, the whole strategy of modern warfare involves the attempt to break the morale of the enemy at home, rather than his front line. Preparation for war, therefore, involves the premeditated and wholesale slaughter of perfectly innocent women and children, and the victory goes to those who can kill the most and the quickest. It is the method of violence reaching out to its most devilish conclusions.

In point of fact, the world has reached the stage when it will no longer approve a war of aggression. Recognizing that war is wrong, because it involves the destruction of life, it still tries to evade the issue by pleading that the end justifies the means. The abrogation of the command not to kill has to be justified in terms of self-defence or morality. Christian people at any rate are not disposed to recognize that men and women may commit adultery if they have what seems to them to be a sufficiently good excuse for it. But the spirit of killing is allowed to disguise itself in the highest

¹ 'Without cause' is almost certainly a later addition.

ideals. Patriotism, the defence of another, even religion itself, may be urged in its justification, but it remains true that war can only be waged through the appeal to hatred, expressed in the propaganda¹ of all that goes to destroy ideals and that reasonable attitude which would prevent men slaughtering their fellow-men. The whole attempt to consecrate the use of military force is really an attempt to justify the killing it involves. To proceed against others by the starvation which is the logical conclusion of economic sanctions, or by bombs, which must be the weapon of military sanctions, is still to kill, and the fact that such killing is done in the name of collective security or of the League of Nations does not square it with the eternal word of God.

Neither peace nor justice has ever been secured by war. It is not possible in the very nature of things that they can be so secured.

'In so far as we are scientists, technicians, or artists, we all admit that the means employed determine the ends achieved. For example, a village blacksmith may be earnestly and sincerely desirous of making a Rolls-Royce engine, but the means at his disposal fatally determine his ends, and the thing which finally emerges from the smithy will be very different from the instrument of precision that he intended to make. What is so obviously true of technology and science is no less true of human activities. The man who uses violence as a means for securing the love of his family will certainly achieve quite another end. The State which makes war on a neighbour will create, not peace, but the making of a war of revenge. The means determine the ends; and however excellent intentions may be, bad or merely unsuitable means must inevitably produce results quite unlike the good ends originally proposed. . . . War, however "just" it may seem, cannot be waged without the commission of frightful injustices; frightful injustices cannot be committed without arousing resentment and hatred; and resentment and hatred cannot be satisfied except by revenge. . . . The means determine the ends, and the end achieved by war is not peace, but more war. . . . To-day the means for making war are so effective that, for the first time in history, indiscriminate, and even unintentional massacre, has become inevitable.'²

But the commandment admits of no exception. It is stark in its demand, Thou shalt not kill. *Dulce et decorum pro patria mori* counters the politician, but war involves a man in something

more than dying for his country or any other cause. His death is the price he has to be ready to pay for killing others, and is only valuable to his country when reckoned in terms of the number of times he has managed to break the commandment against others before another breaks it against him.

But even so, it may be argued, this commandment is one of many, and there is another: 'Render to Cæsar the things that are Cæsar's,' and to refuse to fight at Cæsar's behest is to refuse the whole principle of government. That Christian citizenship has always involved the obligation of loyalty to the State cannot be denied. For all that Cæsar provides in the way of good government and protection, the Christian owes him a debt. But it is at least recognized that some difficulty may arise either when Cæsar is a tyrant who is a terror to the good work and not to the evil, or when he makes demands upon Christians which are contrary to the law of Christ. When a conflict arises and there is a choice between defiance of Cæsar and apostasy from Christ, the Christian answer is already put into his mouth, 'We must obey God rather than men' (Ac 5²⁹). Cæsar may still claim the payment of his debt by way of imprisonment or death. The debt to God can only be paid in that final loyalty to Christ which suffers rather than inflict suffering and dies rather than kill.

Those who in point of time were nearest to the earthly life of Christ, and provide, therefore, the earliest commentary on His teaching, were in no doubt about this. They refuse to pander to nationalism even by burning a few grains of incense to the statue of Cæsar: they decline to support imperialism by joining the Roman army. Well might Celsus ask what was to become of the Roman Empire if all its citizens turned Christian and refused to fight.

Among the Early Fathers—Justin Martyr and Tatian in the second century; Tertullian, Origen, Cyprian, and Hippolytus in the third; Arnobius, Eusebius, and Lactantius in the fourth,—all regarded war as the breach of God's law.³

So Lactantius writes:⁴ 'When God prohibits killing, He not only forbids us to commit brigandage; which is not allowed even by the public laws: but He warns us that not even those things which are regarded as legal among men are to be done. And so it will not be lawful for a just man to serve

¹ Vide, Lord Ponsonby, *Falsehood in War-Time*.

² Aldous Huxley.

³ Vide Hastings, *Encyclopædia of Religion and Ethics*, *The Dictionary of the Apostolic Church*; C. J. Cadoux, *The Early Christian Attitude to War*.

⁴ *Divinae Institutiones*.

as a soldier . . . nor to accuse any one of a capital offence,¹ since it makes no difference whether thou killest with a sword or a word, since killing itself is forbidden. And so in this commandment of God no exception at all ought to be made that it is always wrong to kill a man.'

Origen claims for himself and other Christians: 'So we no longer take sword against nation, nor do we learn to make war any more, having become the sons of peace for the sake of Jesus, who is our leader.' The Canons of Hippolytus even exclude from Communion a soldier until he has done penance for the blood he has shed.

It is indeed not until the conversion of Constantine brings with it the departure from these primitive Christian standards as the Christian community comes for the first time under the protection of the State and becomes a national church, that other writers like Athanasius, Ambrose, and Augustine countenance war, and by their arguments might be said to justify in advance the terrors of the Inquisition, and the tragedy of the wars of religion which would to-day be condemned even by those who might argue the possibility of a just war.

So to-day in the attempt to keep peace with Caesar and faith with God men will argue that Christ meant His followers to act in the 'spirit' of His teaching without being bound by the 'letter,' or that His principles can only apply as between individuals and not as between nations. That in reality is to argue that Christ meant His teaching to be ignored when it came to the real test, and that while He forbids killing as between man and man, any two groups which claim sovereign power can commit murder on as vast a scale as they desire.

¹ Thus the sixth commandment is also taken to forbid capital punishment. The State has no more the right to act as executioner than it has to bid men kill to give effect to its own judgment in international affairs. There is no inherent right to punish as such, but only to redeem, and all punishment must be such as to give the best chance of amendment of life. To kill is to deny a man the opportunity to make good. The death sentence, while it contains a call to repentance, is a denial of amendment. If it be urged that it expresses Society's extreme abhorrence of one particular crime and the value set on human life, it can also be argued that the sacredness of human life is not really shown by robbing man of that very gift. In so far as it is sacred for all, it is sacred for each, and the fact that any particular person has denied its value is no reason for Society to repeat the mistake. Thou shalt not kill is as binding on Society as it is on the individuals who make up the Society. Society cannot restore the gift of life to the murdered person; nor should it deprive the murderer of life.

If it be true that we cannot always take Christ literally, that does not absolve us from the responsibility of taking Him seriously. But if that is to be done it points to a return to the more positive part of His exposition of this commandment. A sincere attempt to enter into peaceful relations with any to whom we have given a cause of grievance is a Christian obligation. All problems which contain within them the causes of war when men will be tempted to kill one another have to be met on one of two assumptions—either that war is inevitable, or that peace is inevitable. The attitude to the problems depends on the assumption which is accepted. So long as nations proceed on the assumption that war is inevitable and killing under certain circumstances justifiable, so long will the way to constructive peace-making be barred. Once the law of life that man shall not kill is accepted as a basic principle, then, and not till then, will nations realize the necessity of proceeding from the other assumption and finding the new method of meeting their problems.

The refusal to take life in war, therefore, both opens up the way for the alternative method and involves a Christian in the obligation so to apply his principles positively in the international sphere that 'Thou shalt not kill' blossoms out into 'Blessed are the peacemakers.'

If men are to be saved from the temptation to kill, the causes of war must be examined more seriously. That certain nations are labouring under a sense of real need and legitimate grievances cannot be denied. That their way of obtaining satisfaction is the right way is less obvious. There is all the more need, therefore, for the calling of the nations to sit on equal terms round the family table and for the setting up of a fact-finding commission. The gift must be left before the altar until the brother is reconciled. Such a process of reconciliation must obviously involve the offering of a gift—a readiness to share life instead of taking it. If by a policy of economic nationalism we strangle economic life, or by a policy of imperialism we demand domination at the price of peace, such policies must be abandoned. An agreement as to raw materials, monetary policy, markets, tariffs, and migration are possible, given intelligence and goodwill. They are an obligation if the commandment not to kill is to issue in the royal edict, 'Love your enemies, do good to them which hate you, bless them that curse you, pray for them that despitefully use you. . . . Love your enemies, and do them good, and lend, never despairing. . . .' (Lk 6^{27, 28, 35}).

The hatred is never safe as a captive. It must be slain with the sword of love.

And that leads to a final consideration. Why is it that with such a clear denial of the right to kill, with such a compelling revelation in the teaching and example of Christ, with such an uncompromising witness from the early Christians, the Church has taken the attitude to war so often recorded against her? The answer lies in the heart of the individual and in those psychological causes which underlie even the economic and political causes of war. However little disposed a man may be to regard himself as a killer, it is nevertheless true that his fears, hatreds, and suspicions are easily roused. The passions and emotions of men and women are dangerous playthings. If the laws of life are seen only in terms of inhibitions and men only seek to repress their impulses instead of rationalizing them, any excuse which affords an opportunity to let themselves go will be welcomed. 'The sword of the Lord and of Gideon'—a righteous war—a war of defence—and these repressed desires can have full swing. There is the reason for the alliance of the warrior and the martyr. But the commandments are not negative prohibitions. Men must always seek to rationalize and not merely to repress their passions. It is indeed as easy to appeal to courage and love, as to fear and hatred. But the technique of violence is only too well known, while we are only at the crude beginning of the technique of non-violence.¹ There are not a few examples of the efficacy of non-violence in political and economic conflicts, but they will be regarded as unnatural exceptions until Christians, refusing the way of violence, understand and apply the central and creative factor in their Christianity. Most of us react to emergencies in a spirit of violence expressed in thought and word, if not in deed. Some one is stupid—breaks a promise—is scornful

or contemptuous—gets in our way when we are in a hurry—gives us the wrong telephone number—and how easy it is to break the whole spirit of the commandment as we deny the very law of our life. Yet if we are going to be true to great principles and on great occasions, we must first be true in the smaller ones. If we are going to meet difficult situations without fear or anger, we must cultivate a new attitude to others. The commandment 'Thou shalt not kill' is a call to a new discipline which will make it possible for us to control our thoughts, words, and small acts, as we develop that patience and kindness and endless sympathy which will enable us to meet others in all circumstances without fear or anger, and never give up hope. In the long-run we shall feel towards every one just as we deliberately choose to act towards them. That is the principle of Love as it is set forth in Christ. The suffering which came upon Him came inevitably out of that, though it was not suffering He sought, but service. Though we must abstain from killing, that is not sufficient. We are involved in the positive task of creating life, of feeling its essential unity, of overcoming evil with good. We are not bidden to do nothing. We must resist evil, but we must learn to resist it not by the method of violence, which only increases the evil, but by the method of non-violence, which sets free the redeeming power of love. In the most tragic choice in history men not only set at naught the commandment that they should not kill, they set free a man who in insurrection had committed murder (Mk 15⁷) that they might demand the death of Love Himself.

New advent of the love of Christ
 Shall we again refuse Thee,
 Till in the night of hate and war
 We perish as we lose Thee?
 From old unfaith our souls release
 To seek the Kingdom of Thy peace,
 By which alone we choose Thee.

¹ See Richard Gregg, *The Power of Non-violence*.

Literature.

CHURCH AND STATE ON THE CONTINENT.

THERE is no man more competent to deal with the subject of the Beckly Lecture—*Church and State on the European Continent* (Epworth Press; 6s. net)—than Dr. Adolf Keller. Dr. Keller's wide experience, accurate knowledge, and acute judg-

ment give a quite exceptional value to this volume. He has visited most of the countries of Europe; he is welcome in all the churches as a wise helper of their needs; he is a scholar and a thinker as well as a man of affairs. Although the tragic experiences of the last years should have delivered our churches from their insularity of interest and sympathy, yet there is need of such a trumpet-call to abandon ignorance of and indifference to the

perilous situation of the Christian churches on the continent of Europe.

The volume contains a large mass of material, which will be quite unfamiliar to most readers; but it is so skilfully arranged that the wood can be seen as well as the trees. The first chapter sketches the wider historical background; the Continental Revolutions, their Myths and Ideologies; the second describes the Terms of Relations between State and Church; the third, the Church Policy of the Revolutionary States; the fourth, the Reaction of the Churches in Revolutionary States; and the fifth, the Significance of the Problem for the Œcumenical World. With the minute details of chapters 2, 3, and 4 it is impossible here to deal.

The argument of the first chapter is summarized in this paragraph. 'All these revolutions are explosions of irrational sub-conscious tensions, suppressed desires, religious or anti-religious passions. They happened first and were thought out only afterwards, despite their resounding programmes and their doctrines. If the French Revolution discovered the great liberal ideas of modern time, the present revolutions felt the mysticism of power, the magic of violence, a new call of the urge of life' (p. 25). We think the author is justified in speaking of the *myths* as primary and the *ideologies* as secondary, as consequent 'rationalisations.' Myths they are because desires, impulses, distresses, aspirations find an imaginative and not an intellectual expression, more potent emotionally because irrational; but they are not to be regarded as mysterious, for they can be explained by a searching survey of pre-war tendencies, war impressions, post-war conditions. If we have any criticism of this first chapter to offer it is that the writer does tend to invest the situation with a mystery which does not belong to it. Europe is reaping what it has been sowing.

So we find ourselves in considerable disagreement with the author's theological interpretation in the last chapter. He is not a professed disciple of Barth; but the Barthian theology which we suppose pervades the doctrinal atmosphere of the Continent has affected him, in our judgment, not advantageously, so that he is a far safer guide as to facts than as to their significance. There seems no necessity for apocalyptic interpretations. It is altogether false to assume 'the polarity and eternal antagonism' of Church and State (p. 359); they are not two 'totally different worlds' which must needs be in conflict. They are both human functions in God's own world, both tainted, if not equally, by human folly and sin, but also possible channels of human wisdom and righteousness, nay,

even of divine providence. The human crisis of to-day is a divine *krisis*, for the Church and State are always under divine judgment, reaping as they are sowing. If in some lands the Church is learning 'what it means to be in the world but not of the world, and to represent a heavenly citizenship in the midst of the howling of hell' (p. 363), in others it seems possible for them to be not *of* the world in their standards and yet *in* the world by their influence—'the leaven leavening the lump till the whole be leavened,' using their 'heavenly citizenship' so that the 'howling of hell' shall not be heard. If the 'Life and Work (Stockholm) Movement' stands for anything, it is surely a belief in and hope of a Christianizing of human society (including the State). We urge this so strongly because it would be a disaster if the morbid mood induced by abnormal circumstances, such as this volume sometimes betrays, were to become a permanent disposition in the churches—to hold aloof from the world instead of offering themselves to God's sovereign grace as the willing instruments in His hand of His redeeming and reconciling purpose in the world. The author urges the churches to come together because of their common need and danger, and his plea we fully endorse. But should they not need to be drawn together by the common aim and hope of the Kingdom of God? Again, what evidence is there to justify the use of such language as this sentence, 'In the controversy with the State, they (the churches) know that they have to struggle, not with flesh and blood alone, not with political parties and corrupt leaders, not with law and violence, but with principalities and powers which would overwhelm the little flock, but for the presence of its heavenly Shepherd' (p. 364)? We have never felt it necessary to take over the Apostle's angelology and demonology with his gospel *sola gratia sola fide*. There may be angels and demons; but we have no knowledge of their activity apart from human agency; and it is better for us to inquire what is the human folly and sin which are bringing these evils on the world. Dr. Keller knows and understands the Continent better than he does England. To cite the Prayer Book controversy as an instance of the interference of the State in the Church is quite to misrepresent the situation. The Government did not want, or demand, the rejection of the revised book. It was the conviction of Christian people, Anglican and Nonconformist, that Protestantism was in danger, which, using Parliament as its instrument, defeated the proposal. This fuller reference to the last chapter is justified, as it is the crucial issue for our British churches.

A few further comments seem necessary. The State in all the Continental countries has always been rather suspicious of the Church, and to maintain its own authority has in various ways tried to keep the Church more under control than in our own more favoured land. In the conflicts of Church and State, the Church has usually in the long-run come out victor, and the vanquished State has had to modify its policy; conscience has made a coward of it. We trust that the full statement of the efforts of the State in Russia to bring about the destruction of the Church will convince those who have doubted the evidence of ruthless religious persecution, and will put to shame the apologists for the economic changes in Russia who have been denying patent facts. Great as have been the cruelty and the misery, the effort has failed to stamp out religion from the hearts of many of the people, and in recent months there has been some modification of the policy of the State. As regards Germany, the author seeks to hold the balance even as between the section of the Confessional Synod which is prepared to consider in a conciliatory spirit the more conciliatory attitude of the State and the section which stands out in its opposition; and although we have an impression of what his inclination is, we shall not attempt to shift him from his neutrality. He seems to hold, as we do, that the change of policy was significant as a recognition by the totalitarian State that here the policy of force had failed, and that consultation and persuasion must be tried. Some of the foreign correspondents, in their antagonism to the Hitler régime generally, do not seem to us to have done full justice to, we shall not say the motives, for these may remain suspect, but to the fact itself. Any theological differences from the author which we have expressed are themselves very evidence of the importance and the authority of the book.

HEBREW PHILOSOPHICAL THINKING.

It is commonly held that the Hebrew mind was incapable of philosophical thinking. The statement obviously needs some qualification or explanation, for we all adopt some kind of metaphysical basis for our attitude to life, even though it be that unconscious dualism which is characteristic of most of us. But the Rev. Duncan Black Macdonald, M.A., D.D., in *The Hebrew Philosophical Genius: A Vindication* (Milford; 11s. 6d. net), goes a good deal further than this, and believes that from the time of their earliest extant literature,

the Israelites had developed a conscious metaphysical position. He finds them holding the conception of the Absolute as a personality, indeed as Yahweh Himself. Coupled with this view is an intense stress on life itself, and a deep-seated conviction that all things are in movement, expressed in the very grammar of the Hebrew language. Further, conscience and consciousness are real; there is no room for a doctrine of *Maya*. In true Socratic fashion, the Israelite would identify virtue with knowledge, or at least would hold that all evil is stupidity. The problem of Reason is then discussed, and the history of what we are accustomed to call 'Wisdom' is traced. A special chapter is devoted to Ecclesiastes, and two most interesting sections deal with Greek influence in general on Hebrew thought and with the relation between Plato's *Laws* on the one hand, and the Books of Ecclesiastes and Ben Sira on the other.

The book is extraordinarily interesting and suggestive. Dr. Macdonald is as much at home in classical Greek philosophy as in the Wisdom Literature of the Old Testament, and states clearly, not only the parallels but also the divergences between the two. It is interesting to find that he has little to say about Philo, who seems to him to have abandoned a true Jewish position. Every serious thinker will welcome and endorse the contention that the Hebrew mind regarded Personality as the ultimate expression of reality, though Dr. Macdonald possibly goes too far when he elevates this fundamental conviction into a metaphysical doctrine. He is most at home in his exposition of the great Wisdom books, and his work here must take high rank among modern contributions to the subject. Even if we feel that he has unconsciously read a good deal of Greek thinking, or at least of philosophical speculation, into the naïve and unsophisticated early Hebrew mind, we cannot but be thankful to the author for the clear and stimulating discussion of Jewish thought in the last centuries B.C., which makes this one of the most important and valuable books of recent years.

DR. SCHWEITZER ON INDIAN THOUGHT.

That 'East is East, and West is West, and never the twain shall meet' is a dictum grown, not only trite from overhandling, but fly-blown and discredited in many minds. For his part, Dr. Albert Schweitzer in his fascinating *Indian Thought and its Development* (Hodder & Stoughton; 5s. net) holds that quite obviously there is a distinctive Eastern world-view, which does clash with another

characteristic of the West ; that where they differ is in this, that while the West regards 'existence as something of value *per se*, and accordingly strives to let it reach perfection in oneself, and to preserve and further it in others,' the East looks upon it as 'meaningless and sorrowful, and so resolves to bring life to a standstill in oneself by mortifying the will-to-live, and to renounce all activity that aims at the improvement of the conditions of life in this world'; and that, while these two are not mutually all-exclusive, but both in East and West keep breaking in, and interacting upon one another, still the whole history of Indian thought is the gradual appreciation of the failure of its own ideal of non-activity, and the inflow—slowly, surely, inexorably—of something much more near the Western type of thought and holiness. As Johnson declared that when he sought to be a philosopher something cheerful would keep breaking in, so in India it is the imperious claim of ethics to be given its due place, and its refusal to be ruled out as futile, or of a very limited importance—as it must be in any logical non-active theory of life—that has proved the crux and problem.

In the Upanishads it is, not through clean and kindly living, but through knowledge, that one attains to re-union with the Universal Soul; though Schweitzer prefers the view that every soul—even wild animals and plants—returns into the All in the same fashion, and as inevitably as the most profound of Brahmins. At heart 'Brahmanic mysticism has nothing to do with ethics. It is through and through supra-ethical,' though ultimately they agreed to adopt the theory of Reincarnation, which seems to force ethical considerations to a foremost place, yet somehow did not do so in their case.

The Sankhya gave to ethics no greater importance. But in Jainism it leaps into the forefront, though there the great commandment not to kill or damage is not developed from a feeling of compassion. It was for one's own sake, to keep oneself unsullied, not from a desire to help another or at least refrain from injuring him, that ethics gained its entrance. Even in Buddhism, with its exquisite morality, ethics is only an ethics of thought, a cultivation of kindly feelings, and that for one's own sake, so as not to disturb one's own poise and balance by nasty things like anger and the like, but there is no outflow of sympathy in actual love towards others—love proved by deeds of kindness and unselfishness. 'It is a compassion of the understanding rather than that direct sympathy of the heart which carries with it the impulse to help.' And,

stranger still, even in the Mahayana, whose saints dedicate themselves—renouncing their Nirvana—to endless lives to be used in sacrifice till every lost soul has been found, nothing actual and positive is done for others in this life; at best one dreams of untold sacrifices in some future state for which one is preparing, but meantime stretching out no helping hand at all.

So lingeringly and reluctantly does the East shake itself free from its initial postulate that life is essentially evil, and that non-activity is best and safest. Still it does more. In Japan, for example, there arose a type of Buddhism that burst through the old axioms of world and of life-negation, that held to it stoutly, in the face of its own Scriptures, that life is good and should be lived out to the full. And in India—if Sankara, while making concessions to a popular religion growing up, still will concede little to ethics, and refuses to admit that one's conduct—good or bad—can help or hinder one's progress towards the ideal, one's redemption from rebirth; and if Hinduism, throwing up among its multitudinous forms a monotheism and a bhakti, has 'not yet a demand that love to God shall be actively realised in love to man'—that axiom of Christianity, still the old world and life-negation, under the steady pressure of things ethical, is growing thin. By the time of the Bhagavad-Gita it has come to this that 'action and abstention from action are equally justified' though in that 'most idealised book in world literature' there is no question of loving self-devotion to the God of Love, 'still less the actual step of demanding ethical deeds.' 'It fails to reach the ideal of active love,' and even Ramanuja gets no nearer it.

'When and how does the idea of active love to man arise in Hindu thought beside that of loving self-devotion to God?' From no great teacher, but 'it pushes its way in from popular ethics'—in the Kural and, definitely and at last, in Ramananda (about A.D. 1400). And so, through those who organized the Brahma and the Arya Somaj, to Gandhi still clinging to the old life-negation view, yet with that view in obvious confusion in his mind; for 'never before has any Indian taken so much interest in concrete realities'; and to Rabindranath Tagore in whom the old view disappears, and a fierce and joyous life affirmation takes its place, and is read back audaciously into the ancient Scriptures.

The various sketches in this volume are not long, still in a marked degree it is a full and satisfying little work. If one may hint a criticism, its author has an immense confidence. Even when the way is far from plain, he crashes forward without hesita-

tion; and where scholars fall apart into contending factions, he flings down an assured verdict. And just occasionally facts he seems to have ignored shout their defiance. Aristotle long ago remarked that, as men grow older, words like 'perhaps' and 'probable' begin to creep into their speech. Schweitzer, although he must be getting on, still cannot be bothered with them much. Still he has ample knowledge, and a sound judgment, and a vivid style; and he has given us a really interesting and informing book.

THE DHAMMAPADA.

Without a doubt *The Dhammapada* is one of a very small and select number of the world's most beautiful and helpful books. It is quite short, not sixty pages long. But into these there have been crowded what insight and experience and wise and searching counsel, which no one can read without seeing the way more clear before his feet, without shame for the past, and surely a new resolution for the future. We have had a translation by Max Müller in our hands for nearly seventy years; and others also have essayed the task. Here comes a chaste and gracious rendering, into which its author, the late Professor Irving Babbitt, has put love and care and his whole soul—*The Dhammapada* (Milford; 8s. 6d. net). Bound up along with it there is an essay of some sixty pages upon Buddha and the Occident. 'A wide audience,' so runs the cover, 'will be grateful for this "one word more" from one of the chief thinkers of our time.' If one is not discouraged into laying down the book by that somewhat wild hyperbole, he will find an interesting paper not very deep, in no way new—though one appreciates the stressing of Buddha's insistence on the will—quite sound and competent, if little more, rising at last into a very vivid and depressingly true summing up of our restless, comfort-seeking, earthly-minded age, and a cry of appeal and of misgiving that, unless we pay heed to the Buddha's warning, and relearn to meditate, as he advised; and to adopt his standard of values, putting first things first, what hope can there be for the world?

MINGANA MANUSCRIPTS.

The first volume of this great catalogue—*Catalogue of the Mingana Collection of Manuscripts*, now in the possession of the Trustees of the Woodbrooke Settlement, Selly Oak, Birmingham—

describing Syriac and Garshūni MSS was published in 1933, and was duly noticed in these columns. The third volume will contain Islamic Arabic MSS, in number exceeding 1600, while the fourth will be devoted to Arabic papyri and coins, and the fifth to Greek, Armenian, Ethiopic, Persian, Hebrew, and Samaritan MSS.

The manuscripts with which the second volume—*Christian Arabic Manuscripts and Additional Syriac Manuscripts*, by A. Mingana (Heffer; 30s. net)—is concerned were acquired in the Near East since the Great War on journeys made possible by the generosity of Mr. Edward Cadbury, who has also defrayed the cost of the publication of the Catalogue. Some idea of the comparative rarity of Christian Arabic MSS may be got from the fact that the Mingana Collection of these exceeds in size that of the British Museum itself. The Mingana MSS, a hundred and twenty in all, are arranged under eleven heads, according to subject: portions of Bibles and lectionaries, psalters, commentaries, apocrypha, prayer-books and service-books, theology and theological history, mysticism, philosophy, science, history, and miscellanea. The Syriac MSS are for the most part service-books.

Among the most interesting MSS chronicled here are No. 91, on vellum, written about A.D. 830, the oldest copy in any language of the *Acts of Thomas* and the oldest datable Christian Arabic non-Biblical manuscript [among old and interesting Biblical manuscripts are the two ninth-century leaves of the Latin and Arabic of the *Epistle to the Galatians* preserved at Sigüenza]; No. 43, also on vellum, containing short works of Ephraem the Syrian, written about 880. Dr. Mingana is of opinion that these translations were made direct from Greek, but, unless strong reasons to the contrary can be produced, the possibility that they were made from Syriac must be kept open, not only from general considerations, but from the fact that both these writers were very much read in the Assyrian Church. The collection is not devoid of artistic interest.

Our heartiest thanks are due to Dr. Mingana for this further great service to learning which he has rendered. The Aberdeen University Press has performed its task with its usual skill.

'*Even at the Doors*' (Marshall, Morgan & Scott; 2s. 6d. net), by Mr. F. J. Miles, D.S.O., O.B.E., V.D., who has already adventured several times upon authorship and presumably commands a reading public, is a study of the Second Advent, of 'the Coming King and the Coming Kingdom.' It is

based on a careful collocation of the Biblical texts from a conservative standpoint, in which the Bible is regarded as the unitary revelation of the Divine will and purposes, and it is informed with an earnest spirit of evangelism. In the introductory part it is explained that it is the fruit of ten years' independent study of the New Testament and that there is no conviction stronger in the author's mind to-day than that 'the Lord Jesus is coming again, personally, corporeally coming; first for His saints, and subsequently *with* His saints, and that the first of these (*sic*) is imminent; He may come at any moment.'

A welcome sign of the renewed interest in the Old Testament is the number of books published within recent years on Biblical Archaeology. The only regret is that so many of these are written entirely from the 'Fundamentalist' point of view, and are directed throughout against the so-called Higher Criticism, however honest and reverent the latter may be. In *Confirming the Scriptures*, by Mr. T. Miller Neatby, M.A., M.D., B.Ch. (Marshall, Morgan & Scott; 3s. 6d. net), we have an excellent little book, though somewhat marred by this feature. There are interesting chapters on the Flood, the Patriarchs, Joseph in Egypt, Abraham and the Four Kings, Jericho and Tell el-Amarna, the Date of the Exodus, Ras Shamra, and other subjects, together with a closing chapter on the 'Historical Accuracy of St. Luke.' Biblical scholars will not agree with all the assumed data, nor with all the conclusions drawn. At the same time, the book gives the ordinary reader a striking and up-to-date description of numerous discoveries in Palestine and elsewhere bearing on the Bible, and it has excellences which should ensure it a wide circulation. It is illustrated, is non-technical, simply and clearly written, and intended chiefly for the general public.

Mr. Albert Eagle, Lecturer in Mathematics in the Victoria University of Manchester, a distinguished student of physics, has written a book which he has entitled *The Philosophy of Religion versus The Philosophy of Science* (copies may be had from Simpkin Marshall; 5s. net). The subtitle is 'An exposure of the worthlessness and absurdity of some conventional conclusions of modern science.' It will be gathered that Mr. Eagle writes with the gloves off. He calls a spade a spade, and if a theory seems to him to be just nonsense he says so. That makes his book quite refreshing. We agree that perhaps it was high

time that somebody, with authority to speak on physics, boldly declared that Einstein's 'curved space' is absurd; or that the enormous difficulties of a theory of evolution with no directing Mind should be so cogently exposed as they are here. Good, too, is the indictment of the scientific curriculum and scientific dogmatism which are too often exemplified. On the positive side, several of Mr. Eagle's views do not seem to us even plausible. Why, for example, he should believe in a kind of reincarnation for all the lower animals while stoutly rejecting it for humanity seems to us quite arbitrary. But on the 'exposure'-side, Mr. Eagle is in our view unanswerable.

When we consider the place held by the prophets of Israel in human thought, we are surprised to find how little we know about them beyond their actual message. Any attempt to write their biographies (Jeremiah and Ezekiel offer the best opportunities) must use a large measure of imagination and may not be convincing in the end. The Rev. Stephen L. Caiger's new book—*Lives of the Prophets* (S.P.C.K.; 5s. net)—is not lacking in imagination and has some knowledge behind it, but it is far from being the success that his 'Bible and Spade' proved to be. The earlier chapters, especially those on Amos and Hosea, do make some attempt at reconstructing a life-story, but the book soon becomes an ordinary—and not very reliable—introduction to the prophetic literature, redeemed from something worse than mediocrity by Mr. Caiger's fascinating style. His imagination has sometimes led him astray; he does not seem clearly to understand what manner of man a prophet was. When other scholars differ, he claims, quite justifiably, the right to choose what view seems best to him. But he sometimes takes a line entirely of his own. For instance, no other modern scholar would ascribe to Jeremiah himself the passages found in Jer 10¹⁻¹⁶ or the 'Babylonian' oracles in chs. 50 and 51. His sense of chronology is weak. He suggests that Amos may have seen Elisha; their 'flourits' are eighty years apart. The date given for the birth of Jeremiah, 560 B.C., is probably a printer's error for 650. Ezekiel's death is placed in or about 565, yet he can say (p. 202) that 'nearly seventeen years were to pass' before the Return—538 B.C. at the earliest, and Mr. Caiger seems to be thinking rather of 520. Why is 590 selected as the date for the birth of 2 Isaiah, making him well over forty when his first prophecies were uttered? In other details, too, Mr. Caiger is to be accepted with caution. Was Cyrus a good Zoroastrian? His

inscriptions hardly suggest it. What ground is there for believing that Nebuchadrezzar ever conquered Egypt? The 'Cambridge Ancient History' can find none. How can Necho's delay of three months over the affairs of Judah in 608 (Mr. Caiger says 607, in tacit contradiction of the authorities he professes to follow) be held responsible for his overthrow at Carchemish three years later. Mr. Caiger has failed to understand the evidence of the Babylonian Chronicle, which shows that Necho's

expeditions into Mesopotamia never lasted for more than a few months at a time.

The book is so planned that each chapter may be obtained separately in leaflet form, an arrangement which has its advantages, though it involves a certain amount of overlapping. The chapters on Hosea, Deuteronomy, and the prophets of the restored community may be recommended; for the rest the reader should consult also some standard work of Prophecy or on the Religion of Israel.

Recent Biblical Archaeology.

BY THE REVEREND J. W. JACK, D.D., GLENFARG, PERTHSHIRE.

SINCE 1924 the Oriental Institute of Chicago has been conducting excavations at Megiddo (*Tell es-Mutesellim*), the impregnable fortress city which commands the pass leading through the ridge of mountains running south-east from Carmel. The Institute has been busy stripping off stratum after stratum of the debris, which was deposited by the successive cities built one above another on this ancient site. Thus far the excavation, under Mr. Gordon Loud, the Field Director, has descended to the level of about 1000 B.C., or a little later, the period of perhaps greatest interest in Palestine, as this was the time of the commencement of the Hebrew monarchy. Among numerous interesting finds is that of a long-spouted jug, dating from the Early Iron Age, and decorated in duochrome, with the picture of a man surrounded by land and sea animals, and playing on a harp. The whole setting recalls the myth of Orpheus, but the date and other particulars direct our thoughts rather to David. The picture of the harp, indeed, gives us an almost contemporary illustration of the instrument that David must have used to banish the gloom of Saul (1 S 16²³). The frame is somewhat square, contains four strings, has a large sounding-body below, and unlike modern harps seems to have been easily portable (cf. Ps 137², 'We hanged our harps upon the willows'). Such instruments (the *kinnôr* or 'harp,' and the *nēbel* or 'psaltery') were no doubt the principal favourites employed in the Temple services, and to accompany songs, especially those of a joyous nature. In Solomon's time, they were made of almuq (algum) trees, while the strings were generally of gut (and subsequently of silk or metal). Another unusually interesting discovery is that of a clay model of a sheep's liver. This was found immediately outside the Eastern Temple, and is a unique example of an object which played an

important rôle in the Babylonian religion, being used to discover the will of the gods. A fine specimen of the same kind is preserved in the British Museum. The prophet Ezekiel represents Nebuchadrezzar as standing at a crossroads and having recourse to three forms of divination: 'he shook the arrows to and fro, he consulted the teraphim, he looked in the liver' (Ezk 21²¹ [R.V.]). This inspection of the liver of sacrificial animals for divination purposes dates from the earliest Babylonian times. The science of reading the signs was believed to be the invention of the god Shamash, and a complete set of rules of interpretation had developed during the ages. Being regarded as the chief seat of life (Pr 7²³), the liver was supposed to reveal the future by its convulsive motions, when taken from the sacrificed victim. A similar magical use of it (in this case the liver of a fish) is found in the well-known incident in the story of Tobit (6^{4th}-8²). A large number of ancient house-burials have been found within the city. One of these is evidently that of a lady of great wealth, for across her forehead was found a gold band, her hair was adorned with gold rings, her ears had enormous gold pendants, while a mass of silver rings, beads, and other jewellery was fixed at the shoulder with a gold toggle-pin. As the workmanship may be dated from the fifteenth century, the burial was probably one of those made during the great siege by the Egyptians in 1479 B.C.

One of the most important discoveries has been that of an early population, living in caves and huts at the base of the site as far back as the end of the fifth millennium, over two thousand years before Abraham. This prehistoric 'village' is spread through a layer of twelve to fifteen feet, and appears to have existed for about twenty centuries. The inhabitants, who are believed to have come from

the north-east (perhaps the Caucasus), were already in possession of excellent pottery, but knew nothing of metal. Though installed at first in caves and small shelters, they ultimately built good dwelling-houses, and enriched their pottery with geometric designs and animal figures. They were no longer content with the ordinary graving tool (made of stone or bone) to adorn their vases, but used cylindrical seals of Elamite or Mesopotamian origin. This ancient centre of population ceased to exist at the end of the third millennium, about the time when the Middle Bronze Age was dawning in the country. The results of the excavation go to show that civilization in these early ages was well developed, and, when taken along with those at numerous other sites both in Palestine and throughout the Near East, seem to overturn the vague hypothesis that every age must be more civilized than the last.

We mentioned recently that a clay seal had been found at Lachish with the inscription, '*For Gedaliah who is over the house*,' the individual referred to being doubtless the ruler who was appointed by Nebuchadrezzar to govern Judah after the deposition of its last king, Zedekiah, in 587 B.C. (2 K 25²²). It is an interesting fact that the reverse side of the seal still contains the marks of the papyrus document to which it had been fixed. It is known that the papyrus leaf, when the writing was finished, was usually folded several times and tied with fibre or string. A little fine clay, specially prepared, was then placed over the knot, and the seal impressed upon it. Naturally, the underside of the clay took on the marks of the 'paper,' which was not always smooth. Documents still folded and sealed in this manner have been discovered at several places in Egypt, such as Elephantine, where there was a Jewish colony. The Gedaliah seal shows not only the marks of the papyrus, but the vertical lines of the string, and thus gives us the first attestation of the use of papyrus as writing material in Palestine. The roll of prophecies by Jeremiah, which King Jehoiakim cut with his pen-knife and then burned (Jer 36²³), may have been of this material (the Septuagint uses the words *χαρτίον, χάρτης*), like the text of the Law which, according to Josephus, was despatched to Ptolemy II. When Jeremiah had a deed drawn up in double form, one copy being sealed and the other open (Jer 32¹⁰), he no doubt made use of papyrus, for specimens of similar double contracts have been unearthed at Elephantine. The papyrus plant grew round Lake Huleh, but it is probable that it was imported from Egypt ready made into 'paper.'

We know that, as far back as the twelfth or eleventh century B.C., the Egyptian commissioner Wen-Amon brought five hundred rolls of papyrus to Byblos.

The expression, 'who is over the house' (אֲשֶׁר עַל הַבַּיִת) is the first epigraphic corroboration of a function frequently referred to in the Old Testament. Thus, Ahishar was 'over the house' under Solomon (1 K 4⁶), Arza under Elah (1 K 16⁹), Jotham during the leprosy of Azariah (2 K 15⁵), and Shebna followed by Eliakim under Hezekiah (Is 22¹⁵ 36³, 2 K 19²). The expression sometimes signifies 'steward' merely (as in Gn 44¹), but when applied to the overseer of a palace or royal house, it has a much higher meaning. Jotham, indeed, was regent of the kingdom and 'judged the people of the land' (2 K 15⁵), while Shebna is referred to as *sōkēn* (סֹכֵן), a term which is equivalent to *zuknu* in the Amarna Letters, where the word is glossed with *rabiṣu*, 'commissioner' of Pharaoh. When Isaiah was informing Shebna of the appointment of his successor Eliakim, he details the high functions that devolved upon the latter (22²⁰⁻²²), and from his description we may conclude that the individual who was 'over the house' was one of the chief officers of the king, superior sometimes to the Secretary of State, and perhaps administrator of the whole crown property.

Some striking discoveries have been made by André Parrot at the ancient site of Mari (*Tell Hariri*, on the Middle Euphrates), which was a large Semitic centre of commerce and art, with a brilliant civilization, as early as 4000 B.C. The city continued to flourish till the thirty-fifth year of Hammurabi's reign (2032 B.C.), when this ruler completely destroyed it by first sacking it and then burning it to the ground. The walls are still red with the flames, heaps of charcoal are still to be found here and there, and a brazier which has been found is believed to have been the one used to start the fire. The palace, which is remarkably well preserved, is one of the largest excavated in the Near East. Up to the date of the last report, sixty-nine rooms have been unearthed, and there seem to be as many more beneath the soil. Altogether this enormous royal dwelling must have covered nearly four acres of ground, apart from the storehouses, depôts, and other buildings attached to it. More than 2500 tablets, containing historical and other records, have been found, most of them in the archive department. Among these is an inscribed earthenware disk, about fifteen inches in diameter, which, according to Thureau-Dangin, gives us the names of two more kings of Mari.

Some of the interior walls of the private apartments are painted with geometric designs or human representations, while others have beautiful ornamental friezes or bands five or six feet from the floor, in cobalt blue, red ochre, or black. Perhaps the most remarkable discovery of all is that of two large well-constructed schoolrooms within the palace buildings. One of these has four rows of brick seats, and the other three, some of the seats having as many as four places. Together the two rooms must have accommodated nearly a hundred and fifty scholars. Some large flat bowls, which are believed to be 'inkstands,' have been found on the floor of each room, as well as numerous tablets and other educational material. These are the first well-preserved schools which have been discovered in Mesopotamia dating from such an early period (the end of the third millennium). They were probably meant for the education of the officials and others connected with the palace. We know that as far back as this time (that of Abraham) there was excellent instruction in the large cities in reading, writing, arithmetic, history, geography, astronomy, and other subjects. There were priests and scribes installed as masters of schools or colleges. The pupils copied lists of objects—countries, cities, rivers, stars, gods, trees, stones, plants, birds, cattle, synonyms of words, verbal forms, and other things from the store of tablets that the teacher kept for this purpose. Among the Hebrews in Canaan, education no doubt was more domestic and private, the home being the school, and the parents as a rule being the teachers. Yet the incident in Gideon's experience (Jg 8¹⁴ [R.V. margin]) warns us against unduly restricting the number of those able to read and write in the pre-monarchical period.

The complete and detailed report of the excavations at *el-Mishrefeh* (Egyptian Qatna, twelve miles north-east of Homs), which has now appeared, shows that this ancient city, like Mari, was founded and ruled by Semites, the forerunners of the Hebrews. In the 'High Place' the excavators have discovered six pedestals or bases, built of brick and lime, on which upright stones or pillars (Biblical *masseboth*, wrongly translated 'images' in A.V.) had evidently stood, together with a cedar trunk fixed in the ground which had been part of the wooden pole (Biblical *ashêrâ*, wrongly translated 'grove' in A.V.), representing the ancient sacred tree. These were the indispensable furnishing of a Semitic High Place; and that they were common in Hebrew sanctuaries is clear from references in Hos 3⁴ 10¹, and from repeated condemnation of

them in the successive law-codes (Ex 34¹³ 23²⁴, Dt 7⁵, etc.) and historical books (1 K 14²³, 2 K 17¹⁰ 18⁴). Numerous examples of *masseboth*, of diverse shapes and sizes (generally unhewn blocks five to ten feet high), have been brought to light by excavation. They have been found at Gezer, Megiddo, Taanach, Beth-shemesh, and other places. At Gezer there was a series of ten, of which eight are still standing *in situ*.

A few months ago the Hebrew University of Jerusalem commenced excavations at Napoleon Hill or Jerische, near the coast, two or three miles north of Jaffa. Preliminary investigations were conducted at the spot in 1934 and 1935, but the first discoveries of importance have been made recently. These point to the existence of a Canaanite settlement on this site as long ago as 2000 B.C. or earlier, and the place must have had considerable strategic significance owing to its proximity to the Auja River, boats being able to draw up to the river bank almost opposite the city. The name of the original city is uncertain, but it is believed to be Rakkon (Jarkon) in the portion of Dan (Jos 19⁴⁴). Soundings have also been made at *Ras el-Kharrûbeh* by Bergman and Blair of the American School. As this site (about three miles from Jerusalem), rather than *Anâtâ*, is believed to be the Old Testament Anathoth, some interesting results may be forthcoming. David had heroes from here (1 Ch 11²⁸), and the place is mentioned in connexion with Solomon (1 K 2²⁶), about 950 B.C.

Unfortunately, there is still considerable uncertainty regarding the length of the Hyksos rule in Palestine and Egypt. On the one hand, Professor Albright and others only allow a hundred and fifty years or less for it. They base their argument to a large extent on the famous 'Four Hundred Year Stele.' This granite slab was discovered at Tanis or Zoan (believed now to be Avaris, the Hyksos capital) by Mariette in 1865, and after its engraved inscription had been copied, it was again buried for security, and has only recently been rediscovered by Montet. The inscription states that the monument was set up in the four hundredth year of King Opehtiset-Nubti (believed to be a Hyksos ruler). From Sethe's reading of the words, the scholars referred to conclude that the Hyksos rule began four hundred years before a date just preceding the accession of Rameses I. (which they place in 1320 B.C., according to the new astronomical chronology of Borchardt), that is, just before 1720 B.C.; and as the Hyksos are known to have been driven out of Egypt in 1580 B.C., their period

of rule could thus only have covered a century and a half at the most. On the other hand, Sir Flinders Petrie, in his latest discussion of the question (in the Supplement to *Ancient Egypt*), is more than ever confirmed in his view that the fifteenth and sixteenth dynasties were entirely Hyksos (ruling in Lower Egypt and Palestine), and that they extended to 788 years, while the thirteenth, fourteenth, and seventeenth dynasties were native Egyptian, ruling in Upper Egypt, and were contemporary with the Hyksos ones. This would put the Hyksos entry

into Egypt back to about 2370 B.C. There are difficulties in this view, for it places the Joseph period during the reign of the Hyksos (to whom the Hebrews were closely related), whereas the facts of the Joseph story seem to point to an epoch when Egypt was under the control of a purely Egyptian king. Almost every touch in the story tends to emphasize the alien character of the Hebrews to the Egyptians. The whole problem no doubt can only be elucidated by further excavation and discovery.

A Redefinition of Jesus' Use of the Parable.

By THE REVEREND JAMES D. SMART, M.A., PH.D., GALT, ONTARIO.

THE parables of Jesus are so central for all Christian teaching, and by their very nature form such an attractive subject, that one would expect every aspect of them to have been exhaustively investigated. It is surprising, therefore, to discover that little attention has been given to the relation between Jesus' use of the parable and the most characteristic use of the parable in the Old Testament. Jesus stood in direct line with the prophets in many ways; His work and His message are the consummation of much which is to be found in them. Thus their use of the parable might be expected to stand in some relation to, and to throw some light on, His use of it. Failure to explore this possibility has resulted in a false approach to the whole question of parable and a serious misunderstanding of Jesus' intention in this type of speech.

The orthodox definition of a parable is that it is 'an earthly story with a heavenly meaning.' G. A. Buttrick as recently as 1930 asserted that, in his estimation, this ancient definition can hardly be improved. Jülicher, whose researches in this field were so extensive, defined the narrative parables as 'illustrative instances which establish an abstract religious or ethical truth by the evidence of a concrete case.' In other words, they are interesting little stories intended to inculcate some fine moral or spiritual truth. As a bare minimum definition that may be allowed to stand, for the parable does in every case, at least in the New Testament, convey moral and spiritual truth. But unfortunately it has been accepted as a comprehensive definition, thereby obscuring the unique nature and intention of a whole class of parables which includes some of the most important. Violence has been done to the finest of Jesus' parables; they have been reduced to the dull level of teaching

rather platitudinous truths; their real saltiness and spice have been lost by forcing them into this simple pattern of 'an earthly story with a heavenly meaning.' A definition which included in its scope the prophetic use of the parable would have prevented interpretation from falling into this false channel. Had even the one parable in 2 S 12, of Nathan before David, been taken into account and thoroughly considered, the inadequacy of the customary definition would have been apparent.

A suggestion in this direction has been made by A. T. Cadoux in his book *The Parables of Jesus*. He attacks the usual view of the parables which regards them as merely 'inculcating a commonplace of morals or religion.' 'It is characteristic of the parable to deal neither with the general nor with the generally accepted. Its function is to help home a resented, distasteful, or, at least, difficult truth. In its most pointed use, as in Nathan's parable to David, or Jesus' parable to Simon the Pharisee, it brings the hearer to self-condemnation before he sees where he is being led' (p. 50). The parables 'gain in value when we see them, not as pictorial renderings of accepted truths, but as moments in the creative reaction of Jesus upon the life around Him. They take us into the brunt of His warfare' (p. 59). These words, when first read, seemed a complete anticipation of my own results. But closer examination of the book revealed that the full significance of this point of view had not been seen. No attempt was made to work out the Old Testament basis, and in the detailed interpretation of Jesus' parables no appreciable use was made of this new conception of the nature of parable. Therefore, the task of this essay shall be to establish the existence of a peculiar type of parable used mainly by the prophets and

taken over and used by Jesus as one of His most effective instruments in dealing with men. It is a use of the parable not so much as a method of teaching spiritual truths, but as a means in a definite situation of revealing a man to himself. We might call it briefly—the parable as an instrument of self-revelation.

Nathan's parable before David in 2 S 12 forms an admirable starting-point. David had worked a sly and villainous trick, secretly desiring another man's wife for himself. He had it arranged that the husband, Uriah the Hittite, should fight in the front line of battle where he would be certain to be killed. It was all done so slyly that David deceived even himself as to the real nature of his act. But he did not deceive Nathan; the keen eyes of the prophet missed nothing. Nathan, appearing before David, told a pitiful story of a poor man wronged. He pictured the little home where a pet lamb was the comfort and joy of father and children, then like a tornado into this idyllic scene comes the heartless man of wealth who kills the poor man's pet lamb to feast his guest, instead of using one of his own countless sheep. David's whole soul revolted at the tale of callous cruelty. His anger blazed out, and he vowed that such a man had forfeited his right to live. Suddenly and fearlessly Nathan turned on David and pointed the finger at him—'Thou art the man!' How could any one dare to call that parable 'an earthly story with a heavenly meaning' and think thereby to have defined it? It was a trap which the prophet used to get David into a helpless and defenceless position where the truth would really strike home to him. It was part of a breathless game which the prophet played, with a human soul and his own life for the stakes. It was a sharp sword with which he cut through the iron bonds of self-deception and made a man see himself as he really was. It was a tool in the hands of the prophet by means of which he got inside a man's guard and revealed him to himself. What would Nathan have answered if any one had told him his parable was an illustration of a spiritual truth? I am afraid he would have been a bit mystified to understand how the conclusion had been arrived at. The intention of this parable is not religious or moral teaching, but actually to strike a definite existing moral blindness from a man's eyes. It is a cleverly constructed device for revealing a man to himself. This use of the parable builds upon the fact so plain in human life that we see and condemn faults quickly in others to which we are quite blind when they are present in ourselves. Our conscience is for some

reason remarkably alert and sensitive to the difference between right and wrong when the case presented to us has no personal associations, but when turned upon ourselves fails to show the same sensitiveness. It was to outwit this quirk in human nature that the prophets originated and Jesus perfected this parabolic device.

The presence in the Old Testament of four more instances of this device is sufficient justification for considering it as an independent and consciously developed type in the general field of parable.

A second example is to be found in 2 S 14. Joab secured the services of a 'wise woman' from Tekoa to act out a parabolic story before David. The purpose was not spiritual but political, but the technique was the same. David was led into pronouncing a judgment from which he could not very well draw back; then, having committed himself, he would be forced to agree when this judgment was shown to apply with equal right to his son Absalom.

In 1 K 20³⁵⁻⁴³ an unnamed prophet, taking serious exception to Ahab's merciful conduct towards Ben Hadad, by means of a parable accused the king of breach of trust in letting Ben Hadad go. He himself acted the part of a soldier who, having been entrusted with a prisoner, was now in peril of his life for having permitted the prisoner to escape. Ahab fell readily into the trap, gave judgment, and in a moment was made to realize that he had passed judgment upon himself.

The fourth example occurs in Is 5¹⁻⁶, the Parable of the Vineyard. We may take for granted that in Isaiah's audience would be men who themselves had been or were still owners of vineyards. As Isaiah described to them his friend's experience with his vineyard he would have their full sympathy. They would follow with interest all the preparations, and then when only wild grapes were produced they would share the disappointment and anger of the owner. They would agree with Isaiah in all he said he would do to the worthless vineyard. Suddenly with one stroke Isaiah lays open the parable and shows them that they themselves have been in it all along. They are the vineyard.

Another example of this same thing is to be found in the parable which is formed by the Book of Jonah. The situation which the writer of this book faced was an ever-narrowing nationalism in the religion of his people. His people were unwilling to see in the heathen anything but fuel for the fire of Yahweh's wrath; they were unwilling that the benefits of their religion should be shared with non-Jewish peoples. In order to cut through these

prejudices the writer used the prophetic parable which, under the pretence of telling a story, reduced the standpoint of these people to an absurdity. Sometimes gentle ridicule is more powerful to convince than mighty arguments. As the history of Jonah was unfolded, nationalistic Jews would follow his course with sympathy, since their viewpoint was identical with his. They would agree in ¹² that Jonah did the right and noble thing in letting himself be cast overboard from the ship that the poor heathen sailors might not lose their lives. They themselves would not be lacking in compassion in their contacts with non-Jews along the way of life. But in giving this agreement they fell into a cleverly prepared trap. *Jonah* can be merciful, and *they* can be merciful to the heathen, but God must not be merciful! Such was their religious viewpoint, and who, when it was put to them in this way, would not see the absurdity of it?

The writer had in his story a second hook on which to catch the narrow bigots, in ch. 4, where Jonah pities the gourd which withered so quickly. Jonah may pity a mere plant, a gourd, but God must not pity the poor heathen! That this latter is meant to show the inconsistency of Jonah has long been recognized, but the *reductio ad absurdum* of ch. 1 does not seem to have been noticed. It forms an excellent example of the prophetic use of the parable as an instrument of self-revelation.

We pass now to the New Testament. No claim is made that Jesus' use of the parable is always in line with the prophetic use. The claim is that certain central parables cannot be understood except in the light of this usage. Others may be more in line with Rabbinic parables, and still others conform to no antecedent type.

The New Testament parable which best illustrates Jesus' use of the prophetic device is that of the Good Samaritan. We are fortunate in having full details of the setting of this parable, including the conversation leading up to it, although the importance of this has not been too clearly seen. [B. S. Easton, *The Gospel according to St. Luke* (1926), 172; J. M. Creed, *The Gospel according to St. Luke* (1930), 151, separate the setting from the parable, alleging that their union is due to the work of a later editor.] Here, as in so many places in Scripture, the simple, bare account somehow lets the characters stand out sharply. Every word counts. There before us, as though it were but yesterday, stands the religious lawyer in all the pride of his learning. He counted himself a master in all things connected with the subject of religion. He had the formulas

of religion at his finger-tips in the fullest detail. Thoroughly confident of himself he presumed in a superior way to test out the knowledge of the young Teacher from Nazareth. First, he put a question to Him concerning the attainment of eternal life. Jesus, seeing clearly the man's pride in his definitions and his desire to display his knowledge before the crowd, humoured him and without difficulty got him to answer his own question. The answer being quite correct, Jesus complimented him, and perhaps thought that He had done with the tiresome fellow. Jesus' handling of the situation was superb. He had let the lawyer put himself into a most foolish position. Beginning in a superior fashion to test Jesus' knowledge, he had ended up in a position very much like that of a schoolboy who has said his lesson correctly to his teacher. He was conscious that he had cut rather a poor figure before the crowd, so, in order to justify himself and show he was really a learned man, he followed up with a second question, 'Who is my neighbour?' If Jesus had let him, he would undoubtedly have given a very exact and perhaps lengthy and impressive definition of who must be treated as neighbours and who may be considered as outside the pale. But Jesus saw that it was time to strike home. The hide of the man would be hard to pierce, so He chose His sharpest weapon, the parable.

The story need not be retold. We need note only the significance of the priest and Levite who passed by the poor broken figure at the roadside. They are the experts of religion, men who are devoting their lives to religion. Their callousness is self-evident, and when they are contrasted with the kind-hearted and unselfish-spirited Samaritan, the lawyer has no other choice than to pass condemnation upon himself, for he, like them, is a man whose religion is a thing of formalities which does nothing to meet the real needs of common life. Jesus' abrupt words with which He closes the incident, 'Go, and do thou likewise,' are exactly parallel in significance to Nathan's words, 'Thou art the man!' He drives His thrust straight home so that there is no possibility of mistaking His intention. There is a trace all through, and especially in the closing words, of impatience on the part of Jesus with this man who will talk all day about the correct definition of neighbour, but will never once go out and be a neighbour to his fellow-men.

In this parable the same spirit and the same characteristics stand out as in the prophetic parables. It is not to be classified as 'an earthly story with a heavenly meaning,' or as 'an illustration

of spiritual truth.' It is a weapon with which Jesus gets past a man's guard. It is a well-laid trap. It is a means of cutting into the soul of a man which helps us to understand why the Word is described by different writers in the New Testament as a sharp sword.

The parable in Lk 7⁴¹ was recognized by Cadoux as belonging in this category. It has the identical characteristics. It is fashioned on the spur of the moment to meet the situation. Its aim is not so much to teach a spiritual truth as to make Simon see the truth about himself and about the woman. Jesus is trying to strike Simon's blindness from him. When Jesus began His story, Simon had no reason to suspect that it had anything to do with himself or with the woman, just as the lawyer had no reason to suspect that the story told him was to be applied to him personally. Surprise is an essential element in the technique of this type of parable. It strikes its victim with added force just because, as he listens, he does not expect that it is meant for him. Jesus' parable to Simon conveys spiritual truth. The words, 'and when they both had nothing to pay,' have undoubtedly behind them the thought of man's inability to make himself right with God, a truth Simon needed to hear, and the whole parable illustrates divine forgiveness creating a response of love in human hearts, another truth Simon needed to hear. But when we have said that, we have not touched upon what Jesus intended this parable to do. His intention was to get Simon to commit himself to a general principle, and then to show the application of this principle in Simon's own experience. The parable's truth is in no sense abstract. It is the concrete truth and reality of the soul of Simon and the soul of the woman. Jesus' desire is to show Simon himself as he is.

The Parable of the Sower takes a different form, but it is distinctly a parable of self-revelation. The difference is due to the fact that it is addressed not to an individual, but to a group. Just as Nathan hid David away in his parable, and Jesus hid the lawyer in the Parable of the Good Samaritan, in a similar manner many of Jesus' hearers and professing followers are hidden away in the Parable of the Sower. As He describes the fate of the seed in various kinds of soil, Jesus probes deep into the souls of men and lays His finger on the things which are to defeat the influence of His word in their lives. Some have their whole soul open to the traffic of life, so that the soil is hardened and the seed can find no quiet place in which to grow. Some are superficial and sentimental in their interest, showing unusual enthusiasm at first, but,

the soil being just a thin covering over rock, the roots do not go deep. Jesus catches us all there, for how often we have received and embraced some truth with joy and in a few weeks' time both its remembrance and its influence have passed from us. Its roots somehow were prevented from going deep. Again, how exactly Jesus describes the spiritual condition of many under the likeness of plants growing among thorns, growing but never getting anywhere because the thorns take all the strength of the soil. Then the simple, honest heart which is the good soil and produces the harvest. This is the simple, childlike heart which a man has to have given to him. In all this we see Jesus at work trying to bring men to a recognition of the truth about themselves. His concern is not with abstract religious truths. His purpose is self-revelation as a means of God-revelation.

In the Parable of the Talents it is easily recognizable that Jesus' main concern is with the one talent man. The other two figures are merely sketched. It is the history of the one talent man which is meant to occupy the centre of interest. Some have protested against the harshness of the judgment Jesus passes upon him. What they fail to see behind this harshness is Jesus' concern to rouse actual living one talent men, whom He saw all about Him, out of an attitude to life which was paralysing in its effects. These men whom He knows and loves, Jesus has hidden away in this parable in such a way that they may recognize themselves. His purpose again is to reveal men to themselves.

Other instances of the parable of self-revelation are the parables of the Pharisee and the Publican, and of the Prodigal Son.

This conception of the parable and its use throws light upon the passages (Mt 13¹⁰⁻¹⁵, Mk 4¹⁰⁻¹³, Lk 8^{9, 10}), in which it seems to be suggested that the parables were meant to conceal from the crowd the truths of the Kingdom. These have given great offence in recent years, and have been consistently interpreted as the product of the Early Church's misunderstanding of the parables. Certainly it is impossible to conceive of Jesus speaking the parables with the definite intention of obscuring His meaning. The parables show too clearly His all-engrossing purpose of bringing men to themselves and to God. But is there not a real sense in which their truth is concealed in them? Have we not shown that the concealing of the truth until a man is ready to let it break in upon him as the truth about himself is an essential element of the prophetic parabolic device? The

parable was not used by Jesus as a method simpler than prose for getting His truth across to people. He used it because He recognized in it a most effective instrument of revelation. The parable, when it really reaches its goal, becomes an act of divine revelation. It is not an inculcation of a religious truth, but the breaking in of the light of Truth upon a human soul. There is nothing abstract about it; the truth of the parable is hidden until a man finds in it a revelation of the concrete reality of his own soul.

Is it not conceivable that Jesus may have spoken to His disciples about this sense in which the meaning of His parables is concealed, and that from this arose the idea that they were meant to prevent the crowd from understanding the truth? Jesus rejoiced when He found any individual either in the crowd or among His disciples with an understanding for His truth. But He guarded it in such a way that no man could know it as truth until he was ready and willing to know it as life.

In the Study.

Virginibus Puerisque.

Consider the Flowers.

BY THE REVEREND GORDON HAMLIN, B.A.,
CARDIFF.

'Consider the lilies of the field.'—Mt 6²⁸.

Not long ago I went into a shop to buy some plants and seeds for my garden. There I saw a notice upon one of the boxes of roots ready to plant, and the spelling of that notice made me smile. For it was FUSHIA. Now I wonder if you can spell the name of that plant? So many people always get it wrong, and yet there is an easy way of always getting it right. Because that name, like many other names of plants in our garden, comes from the name of a gardener or botanist who loved flowers.

That name FUCHSIA, for instance, comes from a lover of flowers who lived in Germany in the sixteenth century, whose name was Leonard Fuchs. He it was who did so much to introduce that lovely flower, and so it is named after him. If we remember his name: FUCHS—all the difficulty of spelling will vanish.

Now let us think of another flower which you know very well—the beautiful blue lobelia. It is named in like manner, for if we take off the last two letters, just as we did with fuchsia, we get the name Lobel, and the man after whom this flower is named was Matthew Lobel, who was court physician to King James I. Let us look at yet another popular flower—the dahlia. Once again let us take off that 'ia' at the end, and this time you have the name of Dahl. Andrew Dahl was a Swedish botanist, and he discovered the flower in Mexico in 1784. So it is with the flower clarkia, and you will easily see the English name that is in that flower.

I expect you are asking why those two letters 'ia' are always added to the name of the gardener or the botanist. Well, it simply means 'by' or 'after.' The flower is named after him. Now I want you to think of another name, and this time it is the name of One who is a great Lover of boys and girls. And once again we can add to His name those same two letters 'ia,' but this time we shall add one more letter; and then we get the name which you and I can have for our own—it is CHRIST, and then IA with N—CHRISTIAN. I wonder how many of us really are Christians? How do we know?

Well, you know lobelia, don't you? It is *always* that lovely blue. And you know a dahlia when you see it. All plants bearing that name must be true to the name. So it must be with those who bear the name Christian.

Do you know when the name was first given? We can read about it in the twelfth chapter of Acts. Those who were following Christ in the big city of Antioch were so happy and bright, so kind and thoughtful, so forgiving, that they reminded others of Christ, who went about doing good. So they were given His name, CHRIST-ANS.

I like that story of Peter and John when they were arrested and made to appear before the Council in Jerusalem. We are told that 'when they saw the boldness of Peter and John . . . they marvelled; and they took knowledge of them, that they had been with Jesus.' You see, just as we know certain flowers by their bright colour and their beautiful scent, and also by the way they stand up in the border or the flower-bed, even so do we know boys and girls who are real Christians by their brightness and their sweetness and the way they stand up day by day to all difficulties and temptations.

Yes, we cannot mistake a real Christian. How

good it is to know that the great Lover of boys and girls, after whom we are named, did not live long ago, as did Leonard Fuchs and Matthew Lobel. No, but He lives *now*, and will gladly help us day by day to become more and more like unto Himself, to be true to His Name.

The Aircraft Carrier.

BY THE REVEREND W. J. E. PIGGOTT, R.N.,
DEVONPORT.

'Underneath are the everlasting arms.'—Dt 33¹⁷.

I should imagine that every boy and girl would like to walk round a naval dockyard and see all the different ships of war, for there practically all types and classes are represented—cruisers, destroyers, submarines, minelayers, and trawlers. But as I write there is one ship in the dock totally unlike any of the other warships. She has no guns, carries no armour, and, in fact, except for her colour and the White Ensign flying astern, you would not think she was one of His Majesty's ships at all.

Instead, she looks just like a cargo-carrying vessel of the Merchant Service, and that is just what she was originally, until the Admiralty took her over and transformed her into an aircraft carrier, the very first of the Royal Navy.

This ship carries many seaplanes, and they are shot off the deck into space by means of a catapult. But when the seaplanes leave the catapult they rely on their own engines. They have a good start and then they are dependent upon themselves for success or failure. Don't you think that is very true of life, boys and girls? You and I have all had a good start, good homes and parents, a fine education, and every advantage. Do you know that at no other period in history have boys and girls had such a start in life as we have to-day? But if we have had a good beginning and everything to help us, remember it is then up to us whether we make a success or failure of life.

But when these experiments of launching the seaplanes by means of a catapult were first introduced, accidents sometimes occurred. Perhaps the engine was not pulling strongly enough, or, as sometimes happened, the plane was shot into space before the pilot was ready. But, whatever the cause, when an accident took place, the plane would fall into the sea. Now, fitted forward on the ship are two huge cranes, and they always remind me of arms, for when a plane does fall into the sea, they are immediately thrust out and lift the plane back again to safety. Often, boys and girls, we have

failed, haven't we? But no matter how great our failure, we have been welcomed back to our homes and our parents have given us another chance.

And that is just what our Heavenly Father is doing all the time; lifting those who have failed, and giving them another chance.

I wonder if you have ever heard these words before, 'Underneath are the everlasting arms'; what a beautiful thought! And, boys and girls, it is absolutely true, for no matter how often we fall and fail those Everlasting Arms are always supporting us, ready to help us out of life's greatest difficulties, and, when we fail, to give us another chance.

Trifles.

BY THE REVEREND WILLIAM SOUTER, B.D.,
CUPAR-FIFE.

'Thou hast been faithful in a very little.'—Lk 19¹⁷.

That sounds fine, doesn't it? It gives you a new hope to try again! You feel you cannot do very much as yet, you are too young and small, but you and I can be faithful in a very little. We can attend to what some folks call the *trifles*. Now my dictionary says that a trifle is anything of little value. And I am quite sure that that dictionary is just all wrong, for a trifle may be small, but it is of very, very great value. 'A mere trifle,' as the older folks say, may be most important, the very thing that makes the difference to all else. There is a legend that the city of Rome was once attacked by its enemies by night. Rome, like every other large city of ancient times, was surrounded by high and thick walls. The enemy sought to climb over the walls while the Roman soldiers were sleeping. There were, however, a number of geese kept in the city, and these, hearing the sound of the enemy, began making an awful row, screeching and cackling. This awoke the Roman soldiers, and the city was saved. The cackling might seem a mere trifle, but it saved Rome.

It is the little things that have to be seen to. Your mother has likely often said to you: 'Take care of the pennies and the pounds will take care of themselves.' That is true of the lives we live. By seeing to the little things, we get on. We must be exact. You must be careful with your writing, your spelling, your counting. If you would mount up nearer and nearer to the top of the class you must take pains, be faithful in the little things.

Besides, it is this very thing that makes you polite girls and boys, loved and admired by all. Always remember to say 'Thank you'; always

speak kindly to your parents and to your teachers. You and I must never hold back from doing a kindness because we think it is not worth while doing it. It is the *trifles* that count—the little, nameless, unremembered acts of kindness and of love which are the best portion of a good man's life. My first schoolmaster used to tell us a story of a young man who was studying under a great artist. One day he brought a picture to his master and asked him what he thought of it. The artist pointed out where the colour might be slightly altered, where there might be a heavier line, and a number of what seemed little things. 'Oh, but these are trifles,' said the young man, 'is there no big flaw in it?' And the artist replied, 'Trifles make perfection, and perfection is no trifle.'

Jesus wants us to see to the little things. This man in the story was 'faithful in a very little,' and the nobleman made him a ruler over ten cities. By our being faithful in the little things Jesus can make us rulers over *ourselves*: that will be a step nearer being like Jesus Himself.

The Christian Year.

FIFTEENTH SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY.

A Mind at Leisure: A Harvest Sermon.

BY THE REVEREND F. J. RAE, D.D., ABERDEEN.

'And he said, So is the kingdom of God, as if a man should cast seed into the ground; and should sleep, and rise night and day, and the seed should spring and grow up, he knoweth not how.'—Mk 4²⁶.

The most interesting thing in this picture is the conduct of the farmer. He does his part, sowing in prepared ground. Then he goes away, and 'sleeps and rises night and day'—an elaborate description of ease of mind. Not that he is idle. He goes on with the routine work. But he does not rush to the field to see how the seed is doing. He does not toss on his bed, imagining terrible things that are happening in the field. He sleeps soundly, and goes on with things. He is not indifferent to the fate of the seed. He is a careful farmer, but he is confident and secure, because he knows that now matters are beyond his control. The seed is growing all the time, '*how* knoweth not he.'

It is a fine picture of 'a mind at leisure from itself.' From *itself*, observe; not from foresight or industry or concern, but from its own fears. The picture is of a strong, efficient life; of one who goes about his business, leaving alone the things that

are not within his power. This kind of mind is one of the supreme blessings, precious beyond gold or silver. How is it achieved?

1. Well, first, it came to this farmer because *he had done his best*. He could do no more, and he left it. There is an old jingle which I learned long ago, which contains a wise philosophy:

That man is blest
Who does his best,
And leaves the rest,
And doesn't worry.

But he has no right to the blessing unless he *has* done his best. There is a spurious imitation of this mental ease in the easy-going 'don't care' of the idler. But the Mr. Micawbers have no real likeness to our farmer. We must care, and care all we can, and do to the last ounce of our power. The failures are those who do not care enough. Ease of mind is gained by labour and pains. But, having done all this, we must 'leave the rest.' We must put our mind, and our whole mind, into the business, and then stop putting any mind into it at all.

2. But, further, this farmer enjoyed his ease of mind because *he trusted Nature*. He believed, what is true, that there is an order in the world, there is a rightness in things. The fundamental law that governs everything in this world is that of retribution, retribution of both good and evil. It is the operation of cause and effect, and it is inevitable. You cannot stop results happening. 'Our deeds are like children that are born to us,' wrote George Eliot; 'they live and act apart from our will. Nay, children we may strangle, but our deeds never.' All life is built on that. It is not a sombre doctrine, at least not merely that. It is a cheerful doctrine when it is really believed. This farmer believed it. He knew that what was happening to his seed was not only beyond him, it was happening according to an order which can always be trusted.

It is one of the main causes of unhappiness in the world that people don't really believe this. They fret and worry about their concerns, about what may possibly happen to their business, their health, their children. They are afraid of the future. They fuss and 'buzz' until life becomes a burden; and often they fret themselves into ill-health because they do not believe that things will be what they will be, according to an order that never varies.

It is a blessed thing to know that results are beyond you, that it is not a capricious fate that rules in the world, that there is a decency in things, that the great soul of the world is just. There is a

time for doing, and a time for thinking, and a time for stopping even thinking.

3. Finally, the secret of this farmer's ease of mind was that *he had confidence in God*. He knew there is a steadfast will behind Nature. And therefore he left his work calmly in God's hands. The seed grew of itself—that is the order of Nature. But there was rain and sunshine, and these conditions were with God. The ordering Will behind Nature is the controlling power. The final word is God's. And so our friend believed in the providence of God. That was the deepest root of his philosophic calm. And the mind is never securely and properly at leisure from itself and its fears until it can trust God simply, trust Him by leaving the results of effort entirely in His hands. You do your best; you believe there is a law according to which your best will receive a just recompense. Both these things minister to peace of mind. But this also, and this especially, that you know God speaks the last word. You really do believe that the Power which governs this world and all its affairs is not arbitrary or unaccountable, but righteous and constant. The parable does not go beyond this. It says nothing of God's love. But it has this great message of a righteous Ruler who will take care that effort has its due reward. It is this faith that sets a mind really at leisure from itself. You cannot live a disturbed, fretting, anxious life if you *believe* that life and its events are governed by a constant, just, controlling purpose of good. If you believe that God is real, a God who does things, a God who is here, not up above merely but in your life, that He has a purpose which includes you, you can sleep and rise, night and day, and go about your business with a calm mind. What is most needed is that people should believe their beliefs, should really believe in the living God who actually governs and whose will prevails in the end, always and everywhere.

It is obvious that this little parable casts a wide net. It includes the minister who is sowing the seed of truth from week to week. He ought to put all that is in him into the sowing. He should 'do his best.' He should be more diligent and hard-working than any one in his parish. He should work hard at his preaching, and pray hard too. And then, he should 'leave the rest.' The rest is not his business. If he is slack or idle he has no right to ease of mind. But if he does his part, he knows that the seed will have a harvest. The results he may not see. They are God's concern. The truth is God's truth, and what happens to it may safely be left to Him. The parable includes

also the business man—a remarkable business man, who works hard, adopts the newest methods, is up to date, exercises foresight, gives his mind to the business, and then leaves the rest. It includes also the parent—the right kind of parent, who does everything he can for his children, gives them a good education and a good example, is a good comrade to them, does his part fully, and then leaves them in God's hands. He knows they were God's children before they were his. And so for all of us. When we are tempted to worry, let the image of this quiet, care-free farmer come up before us, to show us how to get, and to keep, this best of earthly blessings—a quiet heart.

SIXTEENTH SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY.

The Law of Sacrifice.

'And every one that hath forsaken houses, or brethren, or sisters, or father, or mother, or wife, or children, or lands, for my name's sake, shall receive an hundredfold, and shall inherit everlasting life.'—Mt 19²⁹.

The question, to which this passage furnishes the answer, has been asked by a number of people who might all say to Jesus, 'Behold, we have forsaken all and followed Thee.' Yet almost all the great things of the world have been accomplished because there were, in each case, a handful of people who were willing to make sacrifice for its success. In America to-day, one may see models of the small sailing vessel in which Columbus ventured into the uncharted Atlantic to seek a new world. It is only because this group of heroes left everything to venture into the unknown that contact was established between the Old World and the New. In similar fashion, a little group of courageous men surround Jesus. They have forsaken everything to set sail, under His leadership, into the ocean of a hostile world. It is only because these men were willing to surrender life itself that they were able to conquer a world for Christ. It is probable that there are few among us who have surrendered so much for the sake of Christ. But we all know something of the law of sacrifice that controls all human life.

Only when we belong to the great fellowship of those who have surrendered something important for the will of God has this passage a message for us. For then we know that which must be clear to us if we are to understand this truth: *We have no claims to make upon God*. Every sacrifice which we make for God carries its reward, in itself. It must be good enough for us to have the privilege

of serving God. There is nothing more that we can claim. A few years ago two children broke through the ice near Stuttgart. At the same time an automobile stopped on the shore. The driver threw off his coat, sprang into the water, dived, and breaking through the ice, brought up the children. Their mother was beside herself with joy. 'How can I thank you?' she asked, 'How can I repay you?' 'I don't want any reward, nor any thanks,' replied the man. 'It is enough that I have experienced this moment.'

This is the gospel of the giving goodness of God. For what does Jesus say to Peter's question, What shall we have? He says two things: 1. Although we have earned nothing, God gives us back an hundred-fold that which we have given. 2. This He can do *only* if we know that we have deserved nothing.

1. Here we have one of the most wonderful of the words of Jesus. Does Jesus mean the heavenly reward? No; He means something we receive while here on this earth. In order that we might not misunderstand, this is put in even clearer form in the Gospel of Mark. 'There is no man that hath left house, or brethren. . . . But he shall receive an hundredfold *now in this time*, houses, and brethren, and sisters, and mothers, and children, and lands, with persecutions; *and* in the world to come eternal life.' We shall, then, receive in this life an hundredfold return for that which we have given up. What does Jesus mean by these 'parents, and brothers, and sisters' which we shall receive again? Only those who have given up something that cannot be replaced, for His sake, can understand this. Everything we surrender for His sake is done for love of people who need us. Buddha demanded of his disciples that they should deny themselves some things in order to kill their desire for life. Jesus never demands this. If He expects a sacrifice from us, it has always the one meaning—His love constrains us. It is always done for the sake of others who need our help.

And every one who gives something for love becomes immeasurably wealthy in the very act. What, then, is this wealth which we obtain? It consists of the people whom we have made happy, the old folks, the lonely ones, the under-nourished children, all those whom we have served and who now grow together into a family of fathers, mothers, sons, brothers, and sisters. Jesus has said, 'Except a grain of wheat fall into the ground and die, it abideth alone.' It is not destroyed, but it remains alone. It never escapes from its solitude.

Or, to take another illustration which Jesus has used: He says to His disciples, 'Ye are the light

of the world.' If we possess a beautiful Christmas candle, there are two possibilities for us. We can preserve it carefully in a box, where it will retain its colour and form, but everything about it remains dark. Or we can light it and set it on the tree, where it casts a light all about itself. These are the two ways of life, between which we must choose. We can preserve ourselves as we might the candle, or we can *give* ourselves. We can give our strength, our youth, our time, our rest. We may become old before our time, since we shall feel bearing upon us the burden of human suffering, but there is light all about us. And this warm stream of light which flows all about us is a thousand times more wonderful than the houses, fields, and other things which we have given up. It is really ridiculous to speak of them as sacrifices, so great is the wealth which we receive in their place!

2. God can bestow all this upon us only if we know that we have deserved nothing. The question which Peter asked, and which we all have in our minds, 'What shall we have therefore?' is a very natural question. It does not necessarily imply a greed for reward. We do not desire heavenly pleasures. We would only be certain that we are not throwing away our lives. But still, understandable as this question is from the human point of view, it does not ring quite true. The presence of Jesus makes us conscious of this. Jesus—this great Teacher—does not tell His disciples directly the error in their question. Instead, in our text He tells a story that is inescapable—the story of the labourers in the vineyard.

The owner of the vineyard is paying off his workmen about six o'clock in the evening. First, with untired steps, come the fortunate ones who have worked only since five o'clock, and they receive a denarius. Then come those who have pruned and dug in the vineyard since three o'clock, since noon, since nine in the forenoon. Finally, leaning upon their tools, come the tired, sunburned men who have laboured in the vineyard since six o'clock in the morning. These tired workmen also receive but one denarius, and they murmur, because they have borne the heat and burden of the day! Does it not affect us in exactly the same way when we hear, for example, that one who has wasted his life and ruined his family turns to God at the end and is received by Him? Do we not often have similar thoughts? Where lies the error of this reasoning? The workmen have reasoned it out quite correctly. A full day of labour, which from beginning to end demands self-discipline, is much better than a life patterned after the proverb, 'A

gay life and a pious death' ! There is no mistake in this calculation. But the mistake is, that we calculate at all. Does the man who throws off his coat and leaps into the water to save a drowning person think of the time that he loses, of the clothes that he ruins, or of the medal which he might receive ? No ; he thinks only of the one who is drowning ; everything else is unimportant ; everything else is forgotten.

If we count up the greatness of our sacrifices, we have not yet forsaken everything to follow Christ. We have still kept back something, our beloved human ego that does not want to die. We think that we have overcome ourselves, when we sacrifice our rest, our time, and our hours of recreation. But the old Adam in us is more clever than we think. He is a protean actor. When one of his rôles is ended he disappears, changes his rôle, and now appears in the penitential garb of a monk with deep wrinkles in his face and says to God, 'Behold, I have forsaken all and followed thee. What shall I have therefore ?' We can impress other people with our sacrificial life, but Christ looks deeper. He sees if we have given *ourselves*, our own selves, with our demands and our desires for recompense.

In our text we have seen that God's goodness is limitless. He gives us an hundredfold for what we surrender. He uncovers the last remnant of self-love that remains even in our piety. And then it is that we experience His grace. In the words of Luther :

Though great our sins and sore our woes,
His grace much more aboundeth ;
His helping love no limit knows,
Our utmost need it soundeth.
Our kind and faithful Shepherd, He,
Who shall at last set Israel free
From all their sin and sorrow.¹

SEVENTEENTH SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY.

The Virtue that is Twice Blessed.

'Blessed are the merciful : for they shall obtain mercy.'—Mt 5⁷.

1. We may forget many things, but as long as we live we shall never forget the quality of mercy dropping 'as the gentle rain from heaven, blessing him that gives and him that takes, more becoming to a monarch than his crown.' Mercy was not praised in this fashion before the advent of Jesus Christ. It is true that among the many altars at

Athens one had been erected to Mercy, and Marcus Aurelius erected a temple to Kindness on the Capitol. The gentle Gautama Buddha had inculcated the same spirit. But it was not regarded among thinking people as indispensable to an active, complete life, not thought of as a motive power to be used in redeeming others' lives and in enriching our own.

Then every man, of every clime,
That prays in his distress,
Prays to the human form divine,
Love, Mercy, Pity, Peace.

And all must love the human form,
In heathen, Turk, or Jew ;
Where Mercy, Love, and Pity dwell,
There God is dwelling too.

Now, whatever be the defects of our own day, it cannot be said to be wanting in the disposition to mercy. Indeed, this is one of the marked characteristics of our age. Humane societies abound everywhere. The appeal of suffering in man or beast touches every heart, and all the gifts of science are devoted to the endeavour to minimize pain. So sensitive is the modern spirit that often it cannot bear even the punishment of the guilty. But, as Principal Lofthouse says, 'Mercy is not "letting off."'

Laurence Sterne could be sentimental over a fly, and shed tears at the thought of a captive starling, but his capacity for emotion did not make him either a good husband or a kind father. Human mercy often lacks the gift of imagination. It cannot share a burden because it cannot put itself in another person's place. It may be due to the conflict between two natures like Tom and Maggie Tulliver. 'You have no pity,' says Maggie, 'you have no sense of your own imperfection and your own sins. It is a sin to be hard ; it is not fitting for a mortal—for a Christian. You are nothing but a Pharisee. You thank God for nothing but your own virtues.' Tom Tulliver is not as bad as that—but with his matter-of-fact nature he cannot enter into the feelings of his imaginative sister. With all his common sense he lacks the insight which only comes from vivid and intense fellow-feeling with all that is human. The more we put ourselves in the sinner's place, the more we see ourselves tempted at our weakest point, the more our judgment will be guided by the special circumstances which mark the individual lot.

There is nothing weak, negative, and colourless in Christian virtues. The poor in spirit are not

¹ K. Heim, *The Living Fountain*, 71.

people wanting in spirit, but those who hold it in fine control—those who mourn are not so much the tearful as those who have learned to accept sorrow in the right way—the meek are not people of a placid nature who find it easy to endure anything, but those who have acquired true self-possession. We must have the same regard for the quality of mercy. The merciful, in Christ's sense, are not merely people of a charitable disposition. Never confusing moral distinctions, capable of passionate indignation, Mercy triumphs over personal resentment and shares common burdens with a self-forgetfulness which can only be achieved in a Christian spirit.

2. This Beatitude tells us the sort of world we live in. It is a world which needs mercy. It is a world of weakness, failure, sorrow, and sin. It is a world where people are easily misunderstood and harshly judged, where life goes hard with some one every day. It is a world of strange outrageous situations, created by circumstances over which we have no control.

This world of mingled experience induces that wondrous kindness in fellow-feeling which does so much to mitigate the sorrows of men. George Gissing, so long deprived of the blessing of home, in after days thinks with compassion of the unhappy mortal doomed to the same narrowing experience. 'I should like,' he writes, 'to add to the Litany a new petition: "For all inhabitants of great towns, and especially for all such as dwell in lodgings or any other sordid substitute for Home."'

Our life was redeemed from the low valuation, 'An eye for an eye, a tooth for a tooth,' when Jesus Christ incarnated the Divine mercy and created the new enthusiasm of Humanity. 'Is it not the best answer to all blasphemers of the species,' asks Seeley, 'the best consolation when our sense of its degradation is keenest, that a human brain was behind his forehead and a human heart beating in his breast? . . . and, if it be answered that there was in his nature something exceptional and peculiar, that humanity must not be measured by the stature of Christ, let us remember that it was precisely thus that He wished it to be measured, delighting to call Himself the Son of Man.'

His word of forgiveness does not simply waive penalties and leave the sinner in his predicament. It is a clear moral judgment combined with mercy, which conveys power to live a better life. The restoring mercy of Christ gave the disreputable publican, Zacchæus, his neglected title of nobility: 'for so much as he also is a son of Abraham.' The same restoring touch revealed to Mary Magdalene

her real gift: 'she loved much.' This Divine mercy raised the whole standard of life and the stature of every man. 'When Jesus Christ,' says Maeterlinck, 'met the Samaritan woman, a few children and the woman who ought to have been stoned, then did Humanity rise three times in succession to the level of God.'

3. The enthusiasm of Humanity kindled by Jesus Christ is, therefore, something higher than a natural human sentiment.

It is in the law of forgiveness of injuries done to herself that Mercy shows the greatest triumph of the Christian spirit. There is no rule for Christian forgiveness. Our Lord had said, 'If thy brother trespass against thee seven times a day, and seven times a day turn again to thee saying, "I repent," thou shalt forgive him.' The Divine forgiveness is not finished till it restores the soul. The mercy of God, which begins with forgiving and forgetting, stops short of nothing less than the restoration of the sinner. The demoniac is found clothed and in his right mind at the feet of Christ. The woman whose sins are forgiven 'goes into Peace.' It was not until the prodigal son had put on the best robe, a ring on his hand, and taken his seat at the father's table that there was music and dancing.

'Restore' was a term used by a fisherman to indicate the mending of his broken nets or by a doctor for setting a bone. This surgical term conveys the Christian conception of restoration. 'Restore such an one' is Christ's appeal to the merciful, often tempted to be favourable to virtue and the culture of high ideals without enthusiasm to help failures. Do not shrink from close contact with failure! Call into play head as well as heart, science as well as sympathy, and infinite tenderness. Surely this is the true test of a living or a moribund Church.

'Blessed are the merciful, for they shall obtain mercy.' On the surface this looks like an exact return for our expenditure. No one is satisfied with this book-keeping view of life. No doubt we do see something like it, for there is a great principle of responsiveness in life, making every man, to a large extent, the creator of his own world:

we receive but what we give,
And in our life alone does Nature live:
Ours is her wedding garment, ours her shroud!

But we rise above the book-keeping view of life when we remember that all the Beatitudes are God's gifts. It is His mercy which the merciful man obtains and that is beyond all reckoning. 'For by grace are ye saved through faith; and

that not of yourselves : it is the gift of God : not of works, lest any man should boast.'¹

O Christ who holds the open gate,
O Christ who drives the furrow straight,
O Christ, the plough, O Christ, the laughter
Of holy white birds flying after,
Lo, all my heart's field red and torn,
And Thou wilt bring the young green corn
The young green corn divinely springing,
The young green corn for ever singing ;
And when the field is fresh and fair
Thy blessed feet shall glitter there.
And we will walk the weeded field,
And tell the golden harvest's yield,
The corn that makes the holy bread
By which the soul of man is fed,
The holy bread, the food unpriced,
Thy everlasting mercy, Christ.

EIGHTEENTH SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY.

The Ministry of the Nail and the Goad.

'The words of the wise are as goads, and as nails fastened by the masters of assemblies, which are given from one shepherd.'—Ec 12¹⁴.

It is pretty clear that the last verses (9-14) do not belong to the original book, which ends as it began with the mournful cry, 'All is vanity.' The writer has ranged over a wide surface of experience, but has made no inch of progress.

Wise men, coming after, added these notes of commendation, in which, with varying degrees of insight, they tell what this perplexing book seemed to them to say ; and far the shrewdest and most penetrating of these notes is the suggestion of our text, that the book was meant to play the part of a gadfly stinging dull minds awake. God gives us words like goads as well as words like nails, words which provoke the mind to activity as well as words which make men, in their mortal frailty, already sharers in the rest of God.

If God makes use both of words which stir the mind and words which steady it, we may be sure that we have need of both. One of the greatest of awakening preachers—Hofacker—said of himself that he doubted if his preaching would tell for more than two years in one place. And that is no less true of an unbroken ministry of confirmation ; under its influence questions may be suffered to sleep which *ought* sometimes to be agitated, and even parts of a man's moral being may be asleep, so that, if he worships or serves God at all, it is

with a fractional service, and God wants the whole man. 'There are,' says Harnack, 'resting and rest-giving elements in the proclamation of Jesus, but there are also impelling and inflaming elements,' and, for our spiritual health, we need to keep a place for both.

1. Let us speak of the ministry of the nail—'the resting and rest-giving elements' in God's message. To believe, to believe in God—that is the great word both of Old Testament and of New. The representative figure is Abraham, who was ever a wanderer and a homeless man ; and yet it is said of him that he believed God, and that he died in faith. Through all his wandering and frustration something kept his mind steady, and he died as he had lived, perfectly sure that he had done well in trusting God.

John tells a story of a nobleman who came for help for his dying boy. Many of us have passed that way, and they know the temper in which such hours are put through—a temper part of flurry, and part of despair, when a man is impatient to do something, and in a moment he feels that it is of no use. All who have shared in that experience will appreciate the marvel of this nobleman's behaviour. Jesus said to him, 'Go thy way, thy son liveth ; and the man believed the word which Jesus had spoken to him, and he went his way.' All his despairing panic was at rest. His boy and he himself seemed to have passed abruptly out of their own keeping, with all the agitation and turmoil which that involved, into the hands of One absolutely able and absolutely kind.

In this world of clamorous egotism no lesson is harder to learn. It seems essential to assert ourselves, and it is never easy to let the management of life pass into other hands. The heart knows its own bitterness and its own burden. A man very early learns that no one but himself can fully understand what gain at a particular point means to him ; there are conditions about it, intimate secrets of feeling which he cannot explain. No doubt there might be loftier objects of desire, or objects more wisely chosen, but this is what holds his mind for the time, so that he would be a rich man in his feeling if he could get it, and a very poor and sorry man if he lost it. But just because no one can understand our feeling about things, we the more stubbornly clutch at the reins which guide our life. Faith is difficult, both because we are so great in our own esteem and because we are so little.

In the fulness of time, when faith was doubly hard, One was seen who took it as His peculiar

¹ M. Devine, *The Religion of the Beatitudes*, 99.

office upon earth to stand by all unfriended people. In this Man of Nazareth men saw, and all the ages after them have seen, not man but God—God, showing what is in His heart, God declaring His love towards us. Paul reads the lesson of that revelation for every distrustful mind, 'If he spared not his own son, but gave him up for us all, surely he will also with him give us all things freely.' Dr. John Duncan said of himself, 'I have a great deal of fear in my composition'; and many Christian people, if they were candid, would say the same. They are willing to believe in God's goodwill; but at the same time they would like to watch how He manages, lest He should take away something which they count essential. They believe, but not with all their heart. And the only remedy for that temper is to look more and more at the things outside of us; look at the wounds of Christ, and learn there the mind of God.

What people need in preaching is the broad and joyful proclamation that we have a merciful God. Dr. Dale, in one of his letters, contrasts Moody's preaching in 1883 with what it was in 1875. 'He was just as earnest, vigorous, impressive as before, and hundreds went into the inquiry-room every night. But the results were inconsiderable. I have seen none of the shining faces that used to come to me after his former visit. In 1875 he exulted in the free grace of God. . . . The "do-penance preaching" has had no such results.'

Many people in this world are, like Bunyan, labouring under a burden. He calls it sin; the Scots song says, 'A body's sel's the sairest wecht.' The load of yourself, the guidance of your fortune, the making good of what is past—it is a sore charge. And men need to be told in some convincing way of what God is, so that with a good heart they may lay their burden down. 'We that believe,' says the Apostle, 'do enter into rest.' A man trusts God and is content.

2. But now of the ministry of the goad. In the Church of Jesus, with all its faults and its deep disgrace, there has been a pretty continuous record of progress. There has been growth in doctrine; one by one, the great evangelical ideas have come to their rights in thought and in preaching. There has been growth in conscience—a continuous education in regard to the rights of other men, so that if, in the Church of to-day, we have less of formal piety, we have immensely more of the sense of obligation and the willingness for sacrifice. Such facts as these tell us of the working of God's Spirit in His Church—a Spirit which quickens and enlarges and renews, which shows 'the things of

Christ' to each new generation, translating the eternal, timeless thing into the dialect and the duty of the day. There is a living Spirit of emancipation sent to lead us into all the truth and into all duty, and this ministry of the goad is peculiarly an instrument of the Holy Spirit.

There is a deal of laziness in man which inclines him to resent anything like a new idea or even a fresh presentation of an old one; and yet it is certain that God's message cannot be received in its fulness except by a moving and travelling mind. We must stir up ourselves (and the whole of ourselves, for it is the whole man that thinks) to meet an idea. We must lay hold of it with such mental instruments as are at our command; we must adjust it to other ideas which already we possess, or the other ideas to it, or we shall never make a thought our own. Why, even a stone, dropped into a pond, is welcomed with a splash, and with circles running out to the farther edge; and men and women, in our Christian congregations, imagine that they can receive and profit by the truth without the faintest ruffling of their placid exterior, and without any stirring in the depths.

It is not only minds that need the goad, but consciences. The plague of familiar words is that they set the conscience to sleep. 'I thought that he said what he ought to have said'—that is the unspoken commentary on many a sermon; and even these noble and rest-giving elements of truth have sometimes become a stupefying potion to the conscience. God has done everything, and thus there is nothing required of us. Think how high and hard a conception of duty is given in such a word as this, 'He hath made us priests unto God!' To enter into the holiest of all, where God is, and to go not as an occasional privilege, but as a point of daily duty and honour; and since it is the pure in heart who see Him, to keep one's spirit simple and clear. And then, as if this were not enough for any man, we must seek as priests to help other men to God, to bear them on our hearts and to interpret God to them—how much is wrapped up in that! What scrutiny of self, what revising of standards, what distrust of the accepted and the customary, what willingness to be taught anywhere and in any form! That is *duty*, remember; it belongs to the office into which God has set us; and for its right discharge we surely need some stimulating and innovating voice to break up our self-complacent ease.

And we need the goad to set our wills a-working. Jesus said of His friends, 'They go in and go out, and find pasture,' and some of us need no stimulus

so much as that which would send them out. John Duncan was hard upon himself at this point, drawing contrasts always to his own disadvantage. 'My doctrine about faith was better than Chalmers', but his faith was better than mine.' 'I am perniciously about doctrine; but I lie in bed all day and read, whilst Guthrie is out doing good.' We need to be provoked into doing God's will, and so we

must not, like these stereotyped Jews, look too shyly at words and teachings which are unfamiliar. Their unfamiliarity might, of itself, suggest that they are sent of God. If the accustomed has failed of its end, we must not marvel if He catches at other instruments, and thus 'the words of the wise are as goads.'¹

¹ W. M. Macgregor, *Some of God's Ministries*, 154.

Recent Foreign Theology.

Varia.

THE latest number of the *Zeitschrift für die Alttestamentliche Wissenschaft* (Töpelmann, Giessen; Band liii. Heft 4) affords evidence of the slow but steady progress that is being made in Biblical studies. Hans Bardtke contributes an article on 'Jeremiah as a Prophet to Foreign Nations,' an acute and detailed study of Jer 25^{46f.} Unlike some of the more drastic critics of Jeremiah, he believes that portions of these chapters are 'original,' and endeavours to isolate those sections which should be attributed to this prophet. As is, perhaps, inevitable in such a study, the groundwork is apt to be subjective, but there are points which will make a permanent contribution to the elucidation of a difficult problem. Procksch discusses Origen's Tetrapla, showing that it preceded the great scholar's better known Hexapla. Rieder treats of five passages, hitherto almost unintelligible in the M.T., where he suggests that the difficulties may be solved by explaining certain Hebrew words with reference to their Arabic cognates. Hölscher discusses Job 19²⁵⁻²⁷, concluding that the famous passage does not really suggest a new doctrine of the future life, and comparing it with a couple of verses found in the Book of Jubilees—23^{30f.} Stummer refers to the Vulgate rendering of the obscure phrase in Is 40²⁰ rendered in the A.V. 'He that is too impoverished for such an oblation,' and points out that Jerome understood the former of the two Hebrew words involved as meaning a special kind of wood, though he does not seem to have identified the tree from which it came. Eissfeldt adds a number of Budde's publications (down to 1930 mainly reviews) omitted from a previous list, and there are several short contributions. The Editor, Professor J. Hempel, writes a 'Chronik,' of which the greater part is devoted to the Göttingen Conference of September 1935, already described in THE EXPOSITORY TIMES by Professor Porteous.

The number admirably illustrates the way in which our knowledge is built up, not by startling discoveries or by revolutionary theories, but by the patient and thorough investigation of small details, which must some day find their appropriate place within the framework of a larger whole.

One of the difficulties confronting the beginner in Old Testament studies is that of looking up words in a dictionary. The larger works, such as our *B.D.B.* arrange them under roots, and it is not until the student has acquired some familiarity with word structure that he is able to identify them. Even with a vocabulary like that of Feyerabend, where words appear in strictly alphabetic order, the labour is very great. In this country the S.P.C.K. is trying to meet the need with its series of Old Testament texts, each volume containing notes and vocabulary. In Germany the firm of Töpelmann has for some years been issuing vocabularies to the individual books. Those dealing with Genesis, Jeremiah, the Twelve Prophets, and the Psalms have already appeared, and now we have one on Isaiah—*Hebräisches Wörterbuch zu Jesaja*, by D. Dr. Johannes Hempel (RM.2). The name of the author alone would be an adequate guarantee of thorough scholarship, and the learner will not be disappointed, though there must be comparatively few students in this country who, when beginning Hebrew, have a competent knowledge of German. This German method has the advantage over the British of producing much cheaper books; the British, on the other hand, gives much more general help in the study of the text. Both, however, are certainly of great value in facilitating the study of the Old Testament for those who are still in its early stages.

'Judaism' is a unique phenomenon in religious and secular history; how is it to be explained? That is the question which Herr Kurt Möhlen-

brink sets himself to answer in a little monograph entitled *Die Entstehung des Judentums* (Hanseatische Verlagsanstalt, Hamburg; RM.1.80). He finds a clue in the interaction of the religious and political ideals of the nation, and traces the long process through the whole history of the Old Testament. Far back in the period of the Monarchy, the uniqueness, almost the isolation, of Israel had its roots, and the brief but telling sketch, treating the subject from different points of view, skilfully brings out what the author regards as the significant features of the history. The determining tendencies are particularly obvious—apart from all critical questions of date and authorship—in the patriarchal narratives, the Deuteronomistic demand for the extermination of the Canaanites, the court narratives of David, and the blood-thirsty nationalism of the Book of Esther. There were other influences at work; at certain periods Jewish thought was not inhospitable to foreign ideas, while there is a genuine universalism in the teaching of the prophets and elsewhere. To save itself from external contamination, however, Judaism fell into the opposite danger of close and narrow isolation, resulting in a kind of petrification; the true spirit of the prophets found its development only in Christianity.

The little book is interesting and stimulating, perhaps even challenging in spite of a faint flavour of anti-Jewish prejudice which a critical mind may detect. Sometimes Möhlenbrink's position suggests special pleading, and will hardly stand. The contrast, for instance, between the religious and the political influences in Israel is difficult to maintain, especially when we find Saul as the early representative of the one and David as the champion of the other. Is it possible to separate religion and politics at any time in the period covered by the Old Testament? Was David less a fervent Yahwist than Saul? Had the canonical prophets no political interests and ideals? A far safer explanation of the singularity of Israel's spiritual history would surely be found in the interaction of the two types and orders of society, the pastoral and the agricultural. It will, further, seem to many readers that insufficient allowance is made for the desperate situation in which the faithful, religious Jew found himself in the middle of the second century B.C. But, though Möhlenbrink's presentation of his case is not at all points convincing, his work cannot fail to produce an effect, even if it be only to make others reassure themselves as to their position.

Part III. of the *Siphre zu Deuteronomium*, ed. by

Dr. Louis Finkelstein (Marcus, Breslau; RM.6), has now appeared. There is nothing to add to what has already been said about this splendid piece of work, which has now reached the comment on the Deuteronomistic Law of the Feast of Weeks (Dt 16⁴⁰). It is becoming clearer than ever that this book will be indispensable to every student of post-Biblical Judaism, and we are fortunate in having it so well represented.

Lic. Wilhelm Möller was born three centuries too late. He would have been at home in an age when University honours really went to a 'wrangler,' when theological controversy was a favourite recreation, when little boys could run down the streets of Kendal, in excitement over the logical victory of a Quaker champion, shouting 'Taylor hath the day! Taylor hath the day!' His new publication, *Schäden und Schuld der alttestamentlichen Wissenschaft* (Herrmann, Zwickau; RM.150), illustrates further what was said in THE EXPOSITORY TIMES about his 'Einleitung in das Alte Testament.' Indeed, some of the characteristics of that work are even more marked in this little publication. The passion for argument is rather more prominent; the devotion to a spiritual ideal (which no fair reader can deny to the author) more in the background, in spite of the declaration that the time has now come for the controversy to move on to theological rather than critical lines. The abuse is richer and more picturesque; the author seems to hold that abusive language is legitimate if, and only if, it be employed in the service of conservative orthodoxy (cf. note on p. 10). Further, though we need not suspect Herr Möller's true religious interest, the self-assertion so noticeable in his earlier work is even more pronounced here. We cannot avoid the conviction that the critics' worst offence is that they have not given enough consideration to Herr Möller. German conservatism cannot be congratulated on its champion.

THEODORE H. ROBINSON.

Cardiff.

ADOLF STOECKER, Court Chaplain and Social Reformer, was born on the 11th of December 1835, and came to be Court Chaplain in Berlin in his fortieth year. The centenary of his birth is being widely celebrated in Germany, and this is the occasion for the publication of this book.¹ It is not a biography, as only a very few facts of his life are mentioned,

¹ *Adolf Stoecker, Wille und Schicksal*, von Friedrich Brunstäd (Am Wichern Verlag, Berlin, 1935, pp. 168).

those necessary to understand the man and his witness and work; it is his theological, ecclesiastical, social, and political activity as presented in his preaching, writing, philanthropic effort, and political purpose, which is very fully and clearly discussed. What gives special interest to this volume is that the period of his activity shows a striking parallel to the present situation in Germany. He began his ministry in Berlin just after the first empire (Reich) was instituted after the Franco-German War, when the problem of making a united German nation was being vigorously and sometimes ruthlessly handled by Prince Bismarck. The misery and discontent of the working classes were among the most formidable hindrances to national unity. The Church had lost all influence over the masses in Berlin and other great cities, and the growing Jewish influence (largely freethinking) in the press, politics, and finance appeared a serious menace to this same unity. With an intense conviction that what the nation needed was the gospel, Stoecker set himself to recover as far as possible the influence of the Church as the witness to the gospel. Moved by the needs of the working classes, he was not content with the relief of miseries by the philanthropy of the 'Innere Mission' of which he had the guidance, but advocated and agitated for reform by legislation and administration. This was one of the motives of his entry into active politics. Believing in the *Volkskirche*, the Church as holding itself responsible for the welfare and well-doing of the whole nation, he rejected the idea of the *Staatskirche*, the Church dominated by the State. This was a second motive. Regarding the Jewish influence as not only an economic and political, but also a moral and a religious danger, since it often was offensively and aggressively anti-Christian, he set himself to combat it. This was

the third motive. The reproach of anti-Semitism has been brought against him, and has injured his reputation. Whether he exaggerated the danger or not, his anti-Semitism was no blind prejudice against a race or a religion, nor did he recklessly advocate measures of repression. It was only so far as this influence was foreign and even hostile to the highest interests of the German nation, as he thought it to be, that he entered into conflict with it. To the Social Democrats as to the Liberals he was opposed; he hoped to make the Conservative party, to which he attached himself, an instrument to support the monarchy, unify the nation, and improve the condition of the common people. Strong as was his *will*, it was baffled and broken by *Fate* (hence the sub-title of the book), the relentless and yet subtle opposition of the mighty Chancellor, the failure of his party to support his policy, the loss of the favour of the young Emperor William II. As the story is here told one is reminded of a Greek tragedy. Not only is the book of special interest because of the parallel to Germany of to-day; but it raises issues about *Community, Church and State*, the subject of discussion for the Conference on Christian Life and Work to be held in Oxford in 1937, for the study of which world-wide preparation is already being made. It should be read by all who are going to have any share in this study; and for this purpose I can give it a most cordial commendation. Mistaken as Stoecker may sometimes have been, great as was the failure of his efforts, his was a consecrated, arduous, and heroic personality, with whom it is inspiring to come into contact, as the author enables us to do, and for that we owe him a debt of gratitude.

ALFRED E. GARVIE.

London.

Entre Nous.

THE EXPOSITORY TIMES, 1936-1937.

The October number, which is the first of the new volume, will have an article by Professor Charles E. Raven, D.D., on 'The Teaching of Theology.' It is provocative and will be followed up by articles written from varying points of view offering constructive suggestions.

At the request of a number of subscribers, there will begin in October also a series giving guidance on standard works, 'The Best Books on —.' It is hoped to cover about a dozen subjects.

The 'Ten Commandments' series will be continued with studies from Dr. A. Herbert Gray, Dr. A. E. Garvie, Professor James Moffatt, and Herbert G. Wood. It will be followed by expository studies on 'The Other Beatitudes'—those not found in the Sermon on the Mount. Among other articles appearing shortly are 'Aramaic Gospel—Sources and Form—Criticism,' by Professor W. R. Taylor of the University of Toronto, and 'The Origin and Growth of Religion,' by Canon J. Battersby Harford, D.D.

Liberated Personality.

For some months Dr. A. Herbert Gray has been contributing a suggestive series of articles to the *St. Martin's Review* on 'The Difficulty and the Art of Living.' It is understood that these are to be published in book form later, and they should be looked out for. In the August number his topic is Liberty—inner liberty. 'My main sorrow as I move among my fellow men and women is that so few of them are liberated personalities. Large numbers of them are plainly unhappy, which means that in some sense they are bound. . . . And yet we are all "called unto liberty." How can we attain it? I believe that only some great experience can deliver us,' Dr. Gray says, and adds that he has seen this happen to men caught up in the Socialist movement.

'But,' he continues, 'in any case I am sure that the greatest form and the most sufficient form of releasing experience is the one which comes to those who learn to know the love of God in Christ and are forthwith committed to the service of the Kingdom of God. Such people take it in that God loves them—that they are secure in His love now and for ever, and giving themselves to Him without reserve they escape into liberty. The only constraint that remains in their lives is the constraint of His love. And love never produces a sense of captivity.'

'Of such people it is often said, "Something seems to have happened to them," or, "They have come alive," or, "We hardly know them they are so different—so happy and so free" . . .

'Christianity is . . . a word of God telling us that God loves us—that we are of value to God—that He wants us and waits to give us of His best—and that He is not going to allow any of our faults or our past sins to keep Him from us. He wants communion with us. He wants to pour into us, and into the world through us, His power, joy, and high vitality. He wants to catch up our little lives into His great purposes until they have new meaning and worth and joy in them. He wants, in a word, to give us life—life at its fullest and its best. . . .

'This releasing word of God which is Christianity is so wonderful that we should never have been able to believe it if it had merely been told us. We should then have dismissed it as a sublime but impossible suggestion. Therefore it had to be embodied in a life. And it was so embodied. He who embodied it . . . wherever He went, He released people. . . .

'And the love wherewith Christ loved poor imperfect men and women is the love wherewith God to-day loves you and me. Which is why this great deliverance goes on happening.'

'I met a woman lately in whom life had been set free by an experience of the love of God. And she said to me quite simply, "And now all beauty is more beautiful, and all truth more interesting. All people seem to be more lovable, and the whole world a different place. I find that I am able to love people as I never did before, and my reserve and shyness are melting away." What better description could be written of the liberty which we all want, and with which Christ would fain set us free.'

I believe in the Holy Spirit.

Some time ago Professor J. M. Shaw, D.D., of Queen's Theological College, Kingston, Ontario, wrote an article in 'The British Weekly' on the Holy Spirit. He has now used this as the basis for a small pamphlet on the subject—*The Belief in the Holy Spirit*. It is published by the Stirling Tract Enterprise (3d.), and it entirely revolutionizes our idea of a 'Tract.' This booklet, containing fourteen pages, is a most finished piece of work. There is the basis of sound scholarship—that goes without saying. The thought is so well worked out that one is carried on from point to point and it is all so simply done that no one could fail to follow it. These pamphlets would be excellent to give to those attending Confirmation and Young Communicants' classes, and we can think of many other uses for them.

Dr. Shaw begins with a story of a distinguished preacher whose little girl said to him one day with engaging frankness, 'Daddy, I think I know what you mean when you say that you believe in the Father and in the Son, but I cannot understand the meaning of belief in the Holy Ghost.' 'In this frank confession,' he adds, 'we have the thoughts of many older minds and hearts revealed.' And this in spite of the fact that belief in the Holy Spirit is one of the three great fundamental beliefs in which the essence of the Christian faith has been summed up and expressed in the Church's historic creed.

In the last section of the pamphlet Dr. Shaw deals with Jesus' own representation of the character of the Spirit's working. In it there are three chief manifestations, he says.

The Spirit is first spoken of as the Spirit of truth, leading men into fuller truth and fuller realization

of the significance of Christ's person and saving work. 'I have yet many things to say to you, but ye cannot bear them now. Howbeit, when he the Spirit of truth is come he shall guide you into all truth.' So we have no need to get 'Back from Paul' or 'Back from John' to 'the simple teaching of Jesus.' That the apostolic teaching as to the significance of Jesus' person and work goes beyond the teaching of Jesus Himself is only in line with Jesus' own promise as to the work of the Spirit as the Spirit of truth. Jesus was limited by the disciples' inability to understand or appreciate. And as Dr. Dale of Birmingham put it: "After all, Jesus came not to preach the Gospel but that there might be a Gospel to preach." As a matter of fact and history, it was only after the basis for the Gospel had been laid in His life and death that through the Resurrection and the coming of the Spirit the disciples came really to understand the true significance of Jesus and of His life and work on earth. And all down the ages the Spirit as the Spirit of truth has been at work on the basis of Christ's life and work on earth, leading men into ever fuller truth and understanding of Christ's work and worth.'

Jesus refers to the Spirit as the Spirit not only of truth but of holiness, and so explicitly called the Holy Spirit. "When he is come he will convince the world of sin, of righteousness and of judgment" (John xvi. 8). And all through the New Testament the Spirit is specifically and characteristically the Spirit of holiness as well as of truth, having the fruitage of its working "in all goodness and righteousness and truth" (Ephesians v. 9). So that the Christian life or character in its beginning, middle and end is represented as the Spirit's work. "The fruit of the Spirit is love, joy, peace, long-suffering, kindness, goodness, faithfulness, meekness, self-control" (Galatians v. 22 f.).

'In short,

Every virtue we possess

And every victory won

And every thought of holiness

Are His alone.'

But the Spirit is also the Spirit of power. It is represented 'by Jesus Himself as most inclusively and comprehensively the Spirit of power, and of power especially for witnessing and service.' This was the root idea of the Spirit's working in the Old Testament. And when the promise was fulfilled at Pentecost the disciples were possessed with the stimulating, exhilarating consciousness of a new power in their lives, so that we read, 'With

great power gave the apostles witness' (Acts iv. 33). It was a witnessing not merely by word, not primarily indeed by word, but by life, so that they could say, as some of the early Christian Apologists are on record as saying, 'We speak not great things, we live them.'

'So then,' Dr. Shaw sums it all up, 'when in the words of the Creed we say "I believe in the Holy Spirit," we mean at least three great and vital things. We mean, *first*, that we believe in guidance into ever fuller truth and ever fuller realization of the significance of Christ for the life of the individual and of society. We mean, *second*, that we believe in the possibility of progress in holiness, of "growth in grace" and of ever fuller consecration of life to the Lordship of Christ. And we mean, *third*, that we believe in the ever-present possibility of spiritual reinforcement and empowerment for Christian witness and service.'

The Grace of God.

The President, the Rev. C. Ensor Walters, speaking at the Methodist Conference at Newcastle which was held in July of this year, quoted very tellingly a letter which he had received from Bernard Shaw. 'At the end of 1933,' he said, 'an old colleague in municipal life and an honoured friend, one who is known to-day the world over, George Bernard Shaw, wrote to me, and with his permission I read an extract from his letter: "Read 'A Man's Life,' by Jack Lawson, Labour M.P. The Dean of Worcester made me read it. You must start, however, with a knowledge of what the underground world was before Methodism came and saved it. In those days the men were demons and the women savages . . . but they were honest, upright demons and savages, with solid characters; and it was Methodism that did that for them. I very much doubt whether Shavianism would have been equally successful." Note those significant words and their implication—"Methodism," "Shavianism." Even Bernard Shaw himself wonders whether his doctrines could have wrought what Methodism has accomplished, and in his letter on the same theme he speaks of "the Grace of God."'